DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 100 426 JC 750 055

AUTHOR	Sheller, H. Lynn, Ed.
TITLE	The Community College in Social Revolution: Purposes and Priorities for the Seventies. A Report of the Conference on Values Sponsored by the California Junior College Association's Committee on Values in Higher Education.
INSTITUTION	California Junior Coll. Association, Sacramento.
PUB DATE	72
NOTE	138p.; Marginal legibility on some pages
AVAILABLE FROM	California Junior College Association, 2017 O Street, Sacramento, California 95814 ($2.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC Not Available from EDRS. PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Changing Attitudes; Church Role; *Conference Reports; *Ethical Values; *Humanistic Education; *Junior Colleges; Minority Groups; Moral Development; *Moral Values; Racial Attitudes; Religious Factors; Social Problems

ABSTRACT

To report on the Conference on Values in the Community Colleges, it was decided to publish the major portions of the tape-recorded proceedings verbatim, with few excisions. The theme of the conference was "The Community College in Social Revolution: Purposes and Priorities for the Seventies." The speeches followed by audience discussion were: "The Legal Status of Religious and Values Efforts on Public Communtiy College Campuses," by David W. Louisell; "Purposes and Priorities for the Seventies," by Gerald H. Kennedy; "Dilemmas of the NOW Generation," by Marvin Freedman; "Aspirations of Minority Cultures," by Norval L. Smith; "The Wright Institute Training Program of August and September, 1969," by Dr. Gerald D. Cresci; "American Indians," by David Risling; "Black Aspirations, Goals, and Values," by Joel O. Reid; "Mexican-Americans," by Amado Reynoso; "As Minority Students See Things," by a student panel; "Campus Unrest: Confrontation or Communication," by William H. Orrick, Jr.; "The Emerging Role of the Church in the Community College," by William Hallman; "How We See It," by three campus ministers, Mary Alice Grier, Gary Timmons, Barry F. Cavaghan; and "The Present and Future Roles of Junior Colleges in the Realm of Emergent Values," by a faculty panel. (MJK)

ED100426

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE IN SOCIAL REVOLUTION:

PURPOSES AND PRIORITIES FOR THE SEVENTIES

A REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE ON VALUES

SPONSORED BY THE CALIFORNIA JUNIOR COLLEGE ASSOCIATION'S COMMITTEE ON VALUES IN HIGHER EDUCATION

EDITED BY H. LYNN SHELLER

JC 750 055

PUBLISHED BY THE CALIFORNIA JUNIOR COLLEGE ASSOCIATION
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA
1972

FOREWORD

On January 2-4, 1970, the California Junior College Association's Committee on Values in Higher Education sponsored a values conference at the Asilomar Conference Grounds, Pacific Grove, California, for student, teacher, administrator, and trustee representatives of all California's public junior colleges The theme of the conference was "The Community College in Social Revolution: Purposes and Priorities for the Seventies " Approximately 200 persons attended the conference, of whom about 50 were students

To report such a conference by writing about it would be to omit, mis-interpret, and over- or under-emphasize important matters To report the proceedings verbatim--the entire proceedings were taped and have been transcribed down to the last ah--would be to include a great deal of unnecessary, useless, and distracting material--false starts, repetitions, fillers, apologies, pointless asides, introductions, and matters pertaining to the mechanics of the conference Hence the editor has chosen to eliminate all introductions, social pleasantries, and commentaries by chairmen; all announcements and transitions; and as much of the chaff as possible from the question-and-answer sessions At the same time the editor has included many of the incoherencies, irrelevancies, and non sequiturs that are normally a part of informal discourse--included sometimes because he could not be sure what the speaker meant and wanted to leave it to the reader to interpret for himself, usually because he wanted to preserve the spirit and mood of the occasion It should be added that the condensed version of the audience-participation parts of the conference hardly suggests the resistance offered by some students to following through with the conference program as planned; the resentment of some because of the formal addresses; the desire of some for more free discussion, "rap sessions"; and the dissatisfaction of some because of lack of student participation in planning the conference

In the report that follows the editor has followed the conference outline, session by session He has included the main addresses in their entirety, with all the significant questions and answers that followed them Also he has included the reports, panels, and symposiums, with the relevant parts of audience participation that accompanied them

As one would expect, the verbatim reporting of the unpremeditated spoken word will often be highly informal and colloquial This report is verbatim except for excisions, as indicated above, and the elimination of most grammatical errors, especially those that were gross or distracting

H Lynn Sheller, Editor
Member of C J C.A Committee on Values
in Higher Education
President Emeritus of Fullerton Junior
College

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Special acknowledgement is given to the Fullerton Junior College students who transcribed the original conference tape recordings; to Dr. Ellsworth Briggs' secretaries Mrs. Nickie Moss and Mrs. Nancy Morse for adjusting their workloads respectively for the operation of the conference and its publication and particularly to Mrs. Glennda Larsen, who gave so generously of her time in the typing of this publication; also to Mrs. Barbara Cantrell and her staff of the College of the Redwoods Central Duplicating Services for their many hours of work in actual production.

Additional copies of this document are available at $2.00 each tax and postage paid from the California Junior College Association, 2017 "O" Street, Sacramento, California 95814 (916)-444-8641.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

OPENING SESSION

"The Legal Status of Religious and Values Efforts on Public Community College Campuses," by David W. Louisell 1

Questions and Answers following Dr. Louisell's address 10

SECOND SESSION

"Purposes and Priorities for the Seventies," by Gerald H. Kennedy 15

Questions and Answers following Dr. Kennedy's address 24

THIRD SESSION

"Dilemmas of the NOW Generation," by Marvin Freedman 35

"Aspirations of Minority Cultures," by Norval L. Smith 42

Questions and Answers following the addresses of Dr. Freedman and Dr. Smith 48

"The Wright Institute Training Program of August and September, 1969, by Dr. Gerald D. Cresci 54

Expressions of Thought and Feeling by Representatives of Three Minority Groups

"American Indians," by David Risling 58

"Black Aspirations, Goals, and Values," by Joel O. Reid 62

"Mexican-Americans," by Amado Reynoso 65

FOURTH SESSION

"As Minority Students See Things," by Student Panel, with audience participation 68

FIFTH SESSION

Report on Conference Workshops, by Workshop Recorders

"Campus Unrest: Confrontation or Communication," by William H. Orrick, Jr. 79

Questions and Answers following Mr. Orick's address 86

SIXTH SESSION

"The Emerging Role of the Church in the Community College," by William Hallman 98

"How We See It," by three Campus Ministers

Mary Alice Geier 104

Gary Timmons 107

Barry F Cavaghan 110

"The Present and Future Role of Junior Colleges in the Realm of Emergent Values," by Faculty Panel, with audience participation 112

INTRODUCTION

We proposed in this conference to explore values for today and examine how they fit into community college life. There is nothing out of date about this. Values choices are all around us and the quality of life is determined by choices made by persons, groups, and nations. An example was the March 10, 1967, issue of Life Magazine, a memorial issue to its editor, Henry R. Luce, depicting the values by which he lived. Now, at least in regard to law and order, a different set of values is in evidence today by students and others who take their causes to the streets in violent protests and demonstrations.

A much different set of values was shown by other young people, a quarter of a million strong about a month ago, who thronged to hear the sensual music of rock 'n' roll bands at a race track near Tracy, California. There the traffic jam they caused for miles along Highway 50, their disregard for farmers' property rights, their over-indulgence and drug abuse--these represent vastly different sets of values, but ones chosen nevertheless. The various types of hippies today make use of other sets of values.

The State Department of Education, fearing moral laxity or lack of proper direction in our schools, recently asked a committee headed by Dr. Edward Klotz to provide guidelines for morality. Its report was rejected, and another committee, headed by the Reverend Donn Moomaw, was directed to provide other guidelines based upon good citizenship without the religious overtones which made the first report unacceptable to the State Board of Education. Thus, the value choices of people, their life styles, and the extent to which such matters are a proper subject of discussion in public schools are an ever-present and current problem.

Value choices constantly surround us, and we in the junior colleges should assist students in making theirs the wisest possible, should confront faculty and students with the educational enrichment beyond subject matter, should train students in evaluating and choosing the most desirable values. In short, instructors should guide students in "how to make a life as well as how to make a living."

The importance of the task is indicated by the fact that the 200,000 full-time and 300,000 part-time students of California junior colleges outnumber two to one those of the California State Colleges and University System combined.

Some of the landmarks of the Values Committee of the California Junior College Association are as follows:

1. A statewide faculty conference at the University of California at Davis in 1958 on Moral and Spiritual Values. Dr. Clarence Shedd, formerly of Yale University, had visited many campuses promoting this conference; the Hazen Foundation paid the expenses of those who attended; and follow-up efforts were maintained with the assistance of the staff of the Pacific School of Religion. This resulted in values committees

on more than half the junior college campuses in California.

2. The fostering of speakers on values subjects at California Junior College Association conventions with some using such themes for their entire conference.

3. Statewide telecasting of our 30-minute color film discussion between Dr. Houston Smith of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Dr. Victor Frankl of the University of Vienna on Values Dimensions of Teaching. Subsequent use has been by junior colleges, securing the film from Fullerton Junior College, to promote discussions on this subject.

4. In 1965, providing every full-time California junior college teacher with a phamphlet, Exploring Values, to challenge his thinking along these lines--another part of the Values Dimensions project.

5. In the same effort, encouraging twenty-three teachers in fields ranging from art to zoology to write essays on how values result from their teaching of their particular discipline and compiling these for statewide distribution to junior college libraries.

6. Supplying a booklet of significant values quotations called, Toward a Larger Learning, to all local committees and their libraries.

7. Making available to all Values Committees and their libraries a survey called, Religion and Western Values, which revealed that more than thirty-five California junior colleges teach elective courses in ethics, philosophy, and/or religion. Included in the publication was a statement of basis for teaching such courses in college and sample syllabuses of courses with bibliographies for use by other public junior colleges.

8. Until March 1967, semiannual distribution to all junior college Values Committee members and their libraries of copies of Intercommunication, a mimeographed publication describing values projects then in progress on various junior college campuses to stimulate values activity elsewhere. It was first edited by Mrs. Louise Stoltenberg of the Pacific School of Religion, secretary to the Davis Conference, and was continued as long as graduate assistance at the Pacific School of Religion could be made available to edit and publish it.

9. Representation of the California Junior College Association at the University of California centennial conference at Santa Barbara in February, 1968, on the Study of Religion in California Higher Education, with the junior colleges providing about half of the 150 conferees. There it became clear that the purpose of the junior colleges in teaching religion, ethics, and philosophy courses was to provide enrichment and challenge, whereas the purpose of the four-year colleges was to develop religion majors, persons working toward graduate degrees in religion to staff their own schools in these increasingly popular courses.

Also, the California Junior College Association Committee on Values in Higher Education had unofficial representation at the Asilomar Conference back in February, 1966, sponsored by the United Ministries in Higher

Education and other groups.

10. Unable to secure foundation money to launch a $53,000, two-year project on combating depersonalization in California junior colleges, the Committee turned over to Dr. Charles McCoy of the Pacific School of Religion and Dr. Nevitt Sanford, of Stanford University, its proposal, which these men attempted to expand into their "Total Climates of Learning" endeavors.

11. With the Graduate Theological Union and the United Ministries in Higher Education, the Committee co-sponsored in the summer of 1969 a three-week seminar in Berkley under the direction of Dr. McCoy. The theme was "The Community College and Emerging Life Styles." Outstanding speakers, field visits to Bay area sociological hot spots, and much discussion earned the seminar most worthwhile ratings.

12. The Values Committee members increasingly felt that a repetition of the 1958 Davis Conference was in order. The California Junior College Association's Student Personnel Committee, to which the Values Committee is responsible, enthusiastically approved the conference and secured authorization from the Association's Board of Directors. The 1958 Davis conference was attended by teachers, administrators, and observers from religious organizations. Those attending the 1970 conference included fifty administrators, ten trustees, sixty faculty, sixty students, and about fifteen campus ministers and other churchmen. In the conference, there were those who governed, those who administered, those who taught, those who were actively learning, and those whose council in values matters supplemented the counseling in California's far-flung junior college system. The 1970 Conference is recorded in this volume.

Ellsworth R. Briggs, Chairman
C.J.C.A. Committee on Values in Higher Education
Vice President, Instruction, College of
the Redwoods

THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE IN SOCIAL REVOLUTION
PURPOSES AND PRIORITIES FOR THE SEVENTIES

OPENING SESSION

"The Legal Status of Religious and Values Efforts on Public Community College Campuses," by Dr. David W. Louisell, Elizabeth Josselyn Boalt Professor of Law, Boalt Hall, University of California at Berkeley

We have some very perplexing paradoxical problems to talk about. I think it's accurate to say they are not only pervasive but basic in American society. I do hope that they won't appear dry or technical or at this hour of the day put you to sleep.

I think the real value of this kind of discussion of legal problems largely arises from response to your own interests, so I'm going to try to save considerable time for your questions. But if you feel during the course of my discussion that there is something I should make more precise or clear, I wouldn't resent at all an interruption during the talk so that I could attempt to respond immediately to your problem.

A brief review of the history of American public education in relation to my principal concern, the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, seems to be a logical starting point.

You all remember the basic relevant words of the First Amendment. "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." Then you know the First Amendment goes on to provide for freedom of speech and of the press and the right of peaceable assembly, etc. But our concern this afternoon is with the provision, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

Note that the popular expressions, the euphemisms if you will, for example, separation of church and state, are not in the First Amendment. The exact words, the relevant, exact words are those that I have just quoted.

What was the purpose of this provision, ladies and gentlemen? The First Amendment, as well as the others of the first ten amendments of the Constitution, you remember, were submitted by Congress to the states pursuant to a moral commitment that if the states would ratify the Constitution, the first Congress would propose a Bill of Rights.

In that Bill of Rights, containing so many of our precious guaranties of liberties, we find these provisions against both establishment of religion and prohibition of its free exercise. Why were our forefathers so insistent upon this right at the beginning? It seems quite clear that the original purpose of the First Amendment was to protect the states and the people against a federal establishment of religion and to guarantee the freedom of state practices and establishments. Actually at least eight or nine of the colonies of the original thirteen had established churches to one degree or another. And as a matter of fact five of the states continued to have some form of a specific preferment for a denomination as late as 1791, when

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

the First Amendment was ratified. Massachusetts continued an establishment until 1833.

Thus the provision historically was to guarantee the states against a federal encroachment upon their own religious establishments and their own religious preferences and practices. There was certainly, therefore, nothing anti-religious in the concept of the First Amendment. As a matter of fact, when one considers the time of its formulation and remembers that the last Congress under the Articles of Confederation had passed the famous Northwest Ordinance of 1787 with its provision that religion, morality, and knowledge are indispensable to a free people and therefore the means of education should be forever encouraged--when one considers the Northwest Ordinance and that expression, he would certainly have to have poor sense of history to see in the First Amendment any intention of hostility toward religion.

We pass then quickly over this elementary American history to note that when state public higher educational institutions began to come into being, basically they paralleled the private institutions of the day--Harvard, Yale, Princeton, which of course proceeded from religious conviction, a religious commitment; and we had, indeed, a continuation of the close orientation of higher education to established religion for many years. In fact sometimes it might surprise us to recall today that at least until the 1890's compulsory attendance at chapel was often obligatory in the state universities throughout the United States.

It was during this period, not as a First Amendment case, but as an expression of the attitude of the Court in an immigration case that it was said in Church of the Holy Trinity vs. United States, 143 U.S. 457, 471 (1892), "this is a Christian nation."

Then we come to the next epoch, which, roughly, I think, can be termed a period of secularization of American public higher education, the secularization being, as I see it, to a degree a function of the war, to put it bluntly, between science and religion. The Huxley-Darwin viewpoint, for example, was conceived of as essentially inconsistent with revealed religion. And perhaps, at least in part, a provision of our own California Constitution of 1879, Article IX, Section 8, is a reflection of this; the provision reads thus: "University shall be entirely independent of all political or sectarian influence and kept free therefrom in the appointment of its regents and in the administration of its affairs."

Then we come to what I call the modern era, when the First Amendment itself and its provision--Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof--began to receive specific interpretation, construction, and elucidation by the United States Supreme Court. This is a relatively modern development. For example, in 1923 in the well-known case of Meyer vs. Nebraska, 262 U.S. 390, which involved the legitimacy of Nebraska's attempt to prohibit the teaching in elementary and high schools of foreign languages--and that was held unconstitutional--the Court had occasion to point out that the guarantee of freedom of religion in the First Amendment is also applicable to the states.

You all know, I take it, that the adoption of the Fourteenth Amendment in 1868, following the Civil War, with its fundamental guarantees of due process of law and equal protection of the law against all the states of the Union, has occasioned a continuing constitutional struggle as to how far it forces the states to abide by the provisions of the Bill of Rights, which originally, of course was only applicable, as I pointed out, against the federal government.

In 1923, then, we have this recognition: that although the First Amendment speaks only in terms of Congress, that is the federal government, the provision of the First Amendment on free exercise of religion is equally applicable against the states by reason of the Fourteenth Amendment and against all the subdivisions of state government. And in Cantwell vs. Connecticut, 310 U.S. 296 (1940), the same was said of the establishment clause. But there's one thing we must be careful to note: and it is that, despite the high degree of nationalization in this area, as in so many other areas of American life, particularly since World War II, it is perfectly possible for a state provision to match or even exceed the First Amendment's provision respecting non-establishment of religion, provided only that the state provision doesn't violate the First Amendment's guarantee of free exercise of religion and a history of their interpretation, which we will now briefly review. I think we will show that one might almost conceptualize two horns of a dilemma: no establishment of religion, no prohibition of its free exercise; and the process of reconciling those great provisions has really been at the heart of the interpretation of the religion part of the First Amendment. But also note our own California Constitutional provision which prohibits public grants in aid of a religious sect, church, creed, or sectarian purpose--whatever may be a sectarian purpose, particularly in a modern context. Note that that is a much more specific provision than the First Amendment provision against an establishment of religion.

I would like to caution you also at this time, ladies and gentlemen, against an undue simplification of the problem. We are in a constitutional area where there are many divisions of the problem under the First Amendment; and, of course, the problem's nature is so susceptible of arousing emotional feeling--heat rather than light--that I think it is important to note the exact problem that we are interested in compared with some other important and related, but nevertheless, for our present purposes only peripheral problems. For example, in addition to our problem of any limitations on religion in public education, you have the separate problem of aid to religious schools, or to the pupils of religious schools, and the problem of tax exemption for religious institutions and activities. At this very term, the United States Supreme Court has a case of that nature yet to be decided.[1]

---

[1] Walz vs. Tax Commission, 397 U.S. 664 (1970), since decided, upholds property tax exemptions for property used solely for religious worship.

There is also the problem of the status of conscientious objectors in relation to the draft act. All these problems, of course, bear upon our immediate problem; but precise analysis is assisted by being specific as to what exactly is being focused upon at the moment

Now let's go over briefly what the Supreme Court has done, that is the United States Supreme Court, in this area, both of non-establishment of religion and of free exercise of religion since it first recognized that the First Amendment binds not only the Federal Government, but equally, by reason of the Fourteenth Amendment, binds the states and all local subdivisions of Government.

In 1925 came a famous case, Pierce vs. the Society of Sisters, 268 U.S. 510, where Oregon in effect had tried to abolish private and parochial schools. The Court held that requiring all children between the ages of eight and sixteen years to attend the public schools unconstitutionally interferred with the liberty of parents to direct the upbringing and education of their children. This case is primarily a parental rights case, but is often thought of as protective of religious rights in that its result was to permit continuation of religious schools. Then came the question of the legality of the state coercing a flag salute against the religiously predicated conscience of a dissenting child who didn't want to make the salute because it was alleged to be in violation of the child's religious convictions. That case was West Virginia Board of Education vs. Barnette, 319 U.S. 624 (1943), in the midst of World War II, when the war issue was still far from decided; and I think it is a tribute to the basic libertarianism of this country that we could do this during World War II. When the Normandy landings hadn't yet been made the Court reversed a previous holding that said that the flag salute was a legitimate requirement of the state and held that it was unconstitutional as violative of the religiously predicated conscience of the student. When that question first came to the Supreme Court and went the other way, there was only one voice in dissent, that of Justice Stone; so it shows that to stand up for principle, even in the face of an overwhelming contrary consensus, may ultimately be the basis of a successful realization of constitutional right.

Then came a case that aroused tremendous interest, that of Everson vs. Board of Education, 330 U.S. 1 (1947), involving the right of New Jersey to compensate parochial school parents for bus transportation. Of course, this only indirectly involved today's problem; but the language of the Court, if not its holding, is significant. It said neither a state nor the Federal Government can pass laws which aid one religion, aid all religions, or prefer one religion over another. I assume no one would take issue with the fact there can be no preferment of one denomination over another. But the notion, in relation to the history of the country, that government could do nothing in aid of religion itself, came as a startling declaration to many students of American society, and many predicted that that exact formulation could not endure forever.

Next came the case that perhaps is the high-water mark in the history of establishment-of-religion thinking; namely, McCollum vs. Board of Education, 338 U.S. 203 (1948). There the Court held that voluntary religious instruction--

voluntary at least in the sense that the parents or child could either elect it or refuse it, but it was on public school premises--was an unconstitutional establishment of religion because it aided religion. I felt at the time that some qualification of this viewpoint was inevitable, and a few years later, in 1952, came Zorach vs Clauson, 343 U.S. 306. Also a religion instruction case--but this time under a released-time program off the public school premises--it was upheld by a divided court. And in writing for the Court, Justice Douglas pronounced the oft-quoted words, "We are a religious people whose institution pre-supposed a Supreme Being."

But then in 1962 came the New York Regents Prayer case, Engel vs. Vitale, 370 U.S. 421. This case bothered me considerably because the courts of New York had upheld this prayer on the grounds that it was purely voluntary: the child could even be excused from the room, and there was, at least according to the findings of the New York court, no compulsion to participate unless, of course, mere presence of young children under such circumstances is psychological coercion. The prayer was a very simple one: "Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence on Thee and we beg Thy blessings upon ourselves, our parents, our teachers, and our friends," or words to that effect. But the court held this was unconstitutional on the theory that it was an establishment of religion, because it aided religion.

Next came the Lord's Prayer and Bible reading case in 1963, Abington School District vs Schempp, 374 U.S. 203, in which those practices were held unconstitutional. A number of opinions were written in this case; and some of them--all of them really--are very relevant to the precise problem that we have before us, because a number of the justices went out of their way to make it clear that the teaching of religion, that is the teaching about religion, the intelligent conveying of religious knowledge, is quite a different thing from religious practices and devotion.

Finally, just a term or two ago in 1968, came the case from New York, Board of Education vs Allen, 392 U.S. 236, where the Supreme Court held that the furnishing of a secular text to students at a religious school was not an impermissable establishment of religion because the texts, in the philosophy of the majority of the justices, were not furnished to the school but to the pupils, to the students. But there were several very vigorous dissents in that case--one by Justice Douglas, one by Justice Black.[1]

Well, why this brief resume of the Supreme Court's thinking about the First Amendment? Obviously, not all the cases I've referred to are directly pertinent from a logical viewpoint to our immediate problem, although several of them that aren't so pertinent as a matter of their precise holding, are pertinent in some of the language. One thing that I think we can be quite dogmatic about is that it is erroneous--and I think more and more people recognize this now--automatically to equate the problem of religion in the primary and secondary schools with the problem in the area of higher education. In the only case in this area so far that directly involved higher education, Hamilton vs. Regents of the University, 293 U.S. 245 (1934), the Court held that a compulsory ROTC program was not unconstitutional as violative of the religious consciences of those who protested the training, and the basic rationale of the Court was that university attendance was not obligatory but freely chosen. But even more important, at least under current circumstances, it seems to me, are the underlying realities of higher education in relation to elementary education: the whole problem of inquiry, intellectual inquiry, as contrasted with indoctrination, and the matter of option, a choice of the courses, as opposed to compulsory subjects.

---

[1] As this is printed, several more cases involving public aid to non-public schools or pupils are before the Supreme Court.

I want to come back to this, but let me just mention at the moment that it seems to me that increasingly there is at least indirect recognition that the community college is entitled, in so far as the First Amendment is concerned, to the status of higher education. Recognition of maturity at eighteen years of age more and more is reflected in the ethos of the day. Just this month the United Kingdom's legislation permitting the vote to those of eighteen years goes into effect. Several of our states have already done so.[1]

I cannot see, philosophically speaking, any basis for a rigid refusal to acknowledge that the community college is a part of our higher education, certainly for First Amendment purposes.

Now I would like to enter areas where you will recognize that the "Common Sense" notion of being able to pronounce "yes" or "no" answers is often a false notion. There are areas that we are coming to where there is not the clean, neat deliniation that you would like. There are areas where there are shadings, and therefore one often cannot predict with the certainty that you would like, what a court would rule. I think the fundamental thing for you people to realize is that we're dealing with constitutional concepts here that are not mathematically certain, like the guarantee that each state shall have two senators. We're not even in an area where the historical test is the exclusive or the primary test. For example, the guarantee of the right to trial by jury under the Seventh amendment is primarily an historical matter. What did the right to trial by jury mean when the Seventh was adopted in 1791? We're dealing with concepts that are in part the function of the moral commitment of the people, the basic philosophy of our people. Look at the difference between the cases on desegregation of a generation or more ago, for example, when the separate-but-equal doctrine held sway, and Brown vs. Board of Education, 347 U.S. 483 (1954). We must be frank in our intellectual analysis and acknowledge that due process of law, to a high degree, is a function of the moral commitment, the underlying philosophy of the generation that is applying the guarantee of due process of law.

---

[1] As this goes to press, the Federal Constitutional Amendment providing for the right to vote at eighteen, has been ratified.

Now as for your legal competence, from any constitutional viewpoint, to teach in the area of moral value, I don't see why there is any hesitancy any longer. I take it there is no serious problem. The law is certainly realistic enough to know the urgent needs of the day--to know that the community college, as I believe Dr. Briggs has already pointed out, has more than twice the enrollment of the four-year colleges and universities in California, and the same basic concern with values. Just the other day, I heard a comment from a New York Psychiatrist, "What's all this talk about sex education in our schools?" Certainly, no competent educator is going to take the position that discussion should be strictly a biological elucidation in the area of sex education. Certainly, recourse to the theologies of sex is as legitimate for the consideration of values as the recourse to scientific learning. Both may progress or change from age to age in particulars. Certainly, the religious sources of values cannot be precluded. Look at the logical predicament in which such a position would put us.

Not many years ago, the Supreme Court decided a case, *Torcaso vs. Watkins*, (1961), which held that it was unconstitutional, as a violation of the establishment clause, for Maryland to require of its notaries a public profession of belief in God--that the requirement was establishment of theistic religion as against non-theism. I take no issue with the holding in that case; but the Court went on to equate, so far as I can see for all practical purposes, belief-in-God religions, theism, with non-theism. Well, if it is unconstitutional to establish any one type of religion like theistic religion, presumably, it's equally unconstitutional to establish or prefer non-theistic religion.

Just a few years later, the Court had this dilemma in *Sherbert vs. Verner*, 374 U.S. 398 (1963). A person who lived by Saturday as the Sabbath and therefore refused to work on Saturday was denied unemployment compensation. Her position was, I cannot work on Saturday, because it's a violation of my religion--and the Supreme Court agreed that the State could not condition unemployment benefits upon a requirement of working on a day when one's religiously predicated conscience prevented that--one of the great landmarks in the free-exercise-of-religion provision of the First Amendment.

Isn't it apparent, ladies and gentlemen, that to preclude recourse to religious sources of value is not only not a requirement of the non-establishment clause. On the contrary, the right to have recourse to such values is really a part of the guarantee of the free exercise of religion. You know, one can get very extremist, and therefore non-sensical, about carrying the non-establishment clause to a point where it would absolutely be inimical to the free exercise of religion.

Not long after the *McCollum* case, for example, some people maintained that it would be wrong to permit a religious denomination to have its meeting in a public park on the ground that the public was thereby aiding religion. But short shrift of that foolishness, in my opinion, was made when the issue arose in Wisconsin, where the court pointed out that this kind of an interpretation would be actually at odds with religion. It would be inimical to religion and, therefore, to the free-exercise provision of the First Amendment.

I might also mention that just a few years ago, in 1965, in deciding the conscientious objector case, United States vs. Seeger, 380 U.S. 163, and in holding that belief in the orthodox notion of a personal God was not a condition precedent of a right to claim religious exemption, the Court again in effect equated theistic with non theistic religion, for First Amendment purposes; and therefore, if one is to say that because a value is rooted in religion, recourse cannot be had to that sort of value, we would be educationally helpless or necessarily commited to non-religion or even anti-religion.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are in an area where it is your expertise, not strictly the lawyers', that is the most relevant expertise. What you determine to do educationally as reasonable, fair minded, objective scholars and teachers I would have no fear of defending; certainly against the First Amendment and even against California's more rigid notions of establishment of religion.

Several years ago, one of my colleagues and I wrote a piece that was published in the California Law Review entitled, "Religion, Theology, and Public Higher Education." We tried to be very comprehensive, objective, and thorough. We surveyed the picture for the University, for the State colleges, for the community colleges, both under the federal and state legal provisions; and we ended with the conclusions that the problem of the place of theology in the University has to be faced. The dialogue of an intellectual community is not complete without the participation of theology. We cannot afford to leave its voice indefinitely muted, or to hear it, at most, only tangentially and indirectly.

Ideally, this discipline, overtly and forthrightly, should resume its historic university or college role. Is the ideal precluded for the public university or college by constitutional or other legal criteria? And we reached the definite answer, "No, it is not precluded." The real problem is with you people to produce the right kind of program; and the law, I am confident, will support it.

Just look at what we have proposed at Berkeley now, after quite a period of basic thinking about it. Of course, you know that the University of California at Santa Barbara has its own department of religion. We haven't gone that far at Berkeley, but we are proposing a major program in religion. This is not yet in the public domain, so to speak. I mean it hasn't been published. It still has to be approved; but it has gone far, I am sure, in acceptance. One program would be of Buddhist studies, one of Christian studies, one of anthropological and sociological studies. Note the detail of the proposed program of Christian study--prescribed courses: The New Testament and the Early Church, The Old Testament and Christianity, The Latin Fathers, Byzantine Literature, European Culture in the Middle Ages, Christian Institutions of the Middle Ages, The Development of Christian Moral Rules, The Greek New Testament,--well I could keep on reading for five more minutes here, but you get the idea, some of it is very specific: The Reformation, The Catholic Church since the Council of Trent, The Church of England, and so forth.[1]

---

[1] Since this address, a program of religious studies has been officially inaugurated at Berkeley.

Therefore, I really feel that to talk about a serious problem of the legality of a religious or theological study program in public higher education is just ducking the issue. It's often just a recourse to avoid facing hard practical problems; and I'll admit some of the problems are hard. The problem of being fair is difficult, but as we finally concluded in our study, while some of these practical problems are difficult, it would be unduly pessimistic to regard them as insurmountable. Goodwill and open-mindness, coupled with the American genius for working out feasible solutions in areas where the extremities of dry logic would keep our pluralistic society in intolerable conflict, are certainly as available in our academic life as they hopefully are in our political life.

So I don't think, ladies and gentlemen, there is a serious problem of legal limitation on your scholarship and teaching in the area of religious and values efforts provided you proceed by the standards of scholarship, fairly, truly, seeking to teach about some of the most important things that can be taught. After all, who do you think it was who made this statement? "The relations which exist between man and his Maker and the duties resulting from those relations are the most interesting and important to every human being and the most incumbent on his study and investigation. The want of instruction in the various creeds of religious faith existing among our citizens presents, therefore, a chasm in a general institution of the useful science." That was no cleric. That was a man generally regarded as the greatest American defender of religious freedom, Thomas Jefferson himself.

Now I know there are other areas of great concern to you, and in some I am not sure that one can speak with the certainty with which I spoke in respect of education. As for the problem of cooperating with religious institutions by permitting religious clubs, although there may be more particular problems in California than generally under the First Amendment, my attitude is--and I would not hesitate to defend it--that a voluntary institution should be in no way prejudiced or disadvantaged because it has a religious basis or objective. A student organization, for example, that is interested in a legitimate political pursuit is entitled to the freedom guaranteed by our constitution, and so is a religiously motivated organization.

Lastly, how about the problems on the campus of a non-state-sponsored religious practice? Of course, if the practice is officially state-sponsored in any way, if it is, in other words, college-sponsored, it comes under the condemnation of the recent cases I have just referred to. But if college students on their own itiative wish to carry on purely voluntary religious practices, it seems to me, and I hope increasingly the courts will so recognize, although again there may be more particular problems in California than generally, that to deny the students the capacity to do that in the name of non-establishment of religion would be really to keep them from the exercise of the right of freedom of religion. In other words, to be specific, purely voluntary prayer groups, for example, on campus that are not under the aegis of the college, I would'nt hesitate to defend, certainly in relation to the First Amendment.

Well, you've been very patient, and I'd be happy to try to answer questions.

Questions and Answers after Dr Louisell's Speech

Speaker in audience: I have two questions: Would it be legal for a college to provide rights and facilities on campus for the use of campus ministers or ecumenical centers or a religious activities house, or something along that line? The second question would be, Can a religious organization, or similar group of students or club, hold religious exercises as such on state property? This would be in relation to the statement you made about students privately getting together to have a prayer service or something along that line.

Dr. Louisell: On the question of the college itself setting up a facility we've had a lot of difficulty in California. I would answer "Yes" as far as the First Amendment is concerned. I mean there's nothing in the Federal Constitution in my mind to prevent the college from providing rights and privileges for voluntary action, just as it does in other areas. The question under the California Constitution could be much more serious, and frankly I think, although we've had opinions, for example, from the Attorney General, that may impinge on your problem, I think this would be a very appropriate area in which to get a specific decision by a regular court test of this problem.

On the practices on State property, this too--that is the carrying out of religious practices in California on state college properties--this, too, is not as clear under California law as I think it is under the First Amendment. Provided the practices be voluntary, and if there be no significant college financial involvement, I see no probability of any inhibition under the First Amendment. I would hope also in California this would be true--once again of course, you must bear in mind I'm assuming a purely voluntary practice, as I take it the questioner was, not done by any sort of suggestion of coercion, direct or indirect, of the college itself. I maintain it should be permitted just like any other type of legal activity is permitted--political, social, or otherwise on the campus. This too, I think would be a very legitimate area, if a challenge is made, to push it to an authoritative judicial decision. Remember, opinions of the Attorney General are not the same as the decisions of the Court.

Speaker in audience: You referred to the decision in 1934. Does this still hold that education is a privilege rather than a right?

Dr. Louisell: That decision in the Hamilton case has never been explicitly reversed. It has never been underminded overtly. However, there has been much additional learning since then; and on the precise problem of whether or not that part of the decision would now stand up, I think it is a very serious question, because for many purposes the court has gone very far, as I know you are aware, in pronouncing invalid the old learning, for example, of Justice Holmes--that famous dictum, "No man has a right, a constitutional right to be a policeman." That is no longer good law. Generally, today, a person cannot be required to surrender a constitutional right as a condition precedent to obtaining another legal privilege. And in that regard, I must say the Hamilton vs. Regents case has probably, although not yet explicitly, been underminded.

Question by Timothy Fetler: In a philosophical sense, could one not argue that secularism or naturalism are religions of a type? They are world viewpoints, and that by leaving out all the other traditional forms one is actually promoting a type of religion; namely, secularism or naturalism?

Dr. Louisell: I don't have any doubt that logically there is a lot to what you've just said, and it is arguable that both the United States Supreme Court, I think, and a California court have really taken that step. That is, by equating theistic religion with nontheistic religion, it seems to me that they have led to the logical conclusion that the one is no more to be established than the other, and a California court has very specifically equated, for purposes akin to that which we are now talking about, secular humanism, for example, with theistic religion. If you would read the opinion of that Torcaso case, that Maryland notary public case, you would see a statement by the court in substance, equating theistic and non-theistic religion for First Amendment purposes. Therefore, once you take the step that secular humanism is religion the answer to your question is "yes." Its establishment is also precluded by the First Amendment.

Speaker in audience: There are two points. One is that during the speech there seemed to be an assumption that there is a necessary connection between moral values and religion, no matter how you define religion. That may be unfair to your speech, but I felt that there was that assumption, and it happens to be my opinion, and the opinion of many people, I think, that there is no necessary connection between religion and moral values at all. The other point was that--

Dr. Louisell: Could I comment on that? I didn't mean to imply that so far as my purpose here today is concerned. That raises a philosophical problem beyond my compass today. I suppose, also, that there are various approaches as to how religion is invoked in connection with moral values, that range from authoritative claims to speculative ideas. Yours is really a philosophical question, and I did'nt mean to imply that at all, whatever my personal convictions. All I meant to say is that to preclude religion as one of the possible sources, according to the conviction of the individual or the concerns of the community, of moral values would be a denial of the free exercise of religion's logical implication.

Speaker in audience: The other point that I wanted to bring out was that I thought it strange that you did'nt bring out the point that the development, the legal development, was just the historical expression of certain ideals that are incipient in the Constitution but were not brought out until later. A very graphic example of that would be the institution of slavery, which was recognized under the Constitution for at least about eighty years, and to see the development of the legal decision by the Supreme Court in both that particular thing and in religion as the expression of an ideal which would be, I think, very well expressed by the separation, the complete separation, of church and state.

Dr. Louisell: Well, it seems to me that you may be confusing two different propositions. Of course, you are absolutely right in pointing out that, although the word "slavery" was never mentioned in the Constitution, it was until the Civil War to a degree accepted by the Federal Constitution; but slavery was specifically repudiated, not only by the Civil War itself and of course in part by the Emancipation Proclamation, but specifically it was made unconstitutional by the Thirteenth Amendment to the Constitution. You don't have to have recourse to evolutionary thinking in that regard.

In connection with the religious concept, I tried to do precisely what I think you're talking about: to present it as a problem of historical evolution and to show that just as due process of law and equal protection of the law meant one thing a couple of generations ago, when the problem of desegregation first came before the United States Supreme Court, and something else today, that so also there has been an unfolding of meaning in the religious field. And, in fact, it really began, as I pointed out, relatively recently when a religious case under the First Amendment was explicitly so decided by the United States Supreme Court. And that's exactly one of my main theses, that elucidation of the meaning of the First Amendment has been an evolutionary process from the days when none of our thirteen original states had established religions to today's legal world, where everyone would admit that a formal substantial establishment of religion, of course, is abhorrent to the Constitution. But we must be on guard to prevent personal idiosyncrasies, including anti-religious bias, from masquerading as constitutional interpretation.

Speaker in audience: Dr. Louisell, your presentation encouraged the teaching of moral values in the classroom by the instructor. You didn't, however, bother to spell out just precisely how this might be done. Do you mean that the instructor ought to represent a kind of comparative morality which might include everything from situation ethics to Puritan ethics to the hang-loose ethic, or do you mean that the instructor ought to be encouraged to impose his own moral system of values on his class?

Dr. Louisell: I don't think, strictly speaking, that an instructor should ever impose anything on a class. My answer to that would be, "No." The best method of doing this isn't really the law's problem. The law's function here is to delimit educators from doing things that are unconstitutional, but the initiative on how to do it, of course, is a matter of the educator's competence. I think there are many ways of doing it. I, for example, cannot discuss a number of questions in my own classes even in as technical a subject as Evidence without impinging upon serious moral values. For example, the problem of confidential communications has all sorts of underlying moral problems, doesn't it? The problem of the guarantee against compulsory self-incrimination really has underlying moral problems. The problem of a dying declaration, as an exception to the hearsay rule, has significant underlying theological notions, and when I come to one of these things, I think it is incumbent upon me to present the total picture as scholarly, as comprehensively, as thoroughly as I can, and answer all questions that I possibly can, but certainly not to impose my particular theology, or attempt to. I certainly wouldn't get away with it if I tried; but I wouldn't try to do so.

Speaker in audience: Doctor, in the L. A. Times, I believe I read a case where in some of the eastern schools they are now reciting prayers from the Congressional Record. Is this something that you've come across? I want to ask a second question related to that also.

Dr. Louisell: All I know about that, too, is what I have noted in the papers. The origin of that presumably is the recognition, in the Bible reading case and in some of the earlier cases that I referred to, that there is nothing in those decisions to preclude normal patriotic performances, normal patriotic symbolism, so to speak, even though, incidentally it involves religious elements; for example, a verse of the Star Spangled Banner itself includes the words, "In God is our trust"; and I suppose the notion was, what can be more secular and governmental than reading from the *Congressional Record*. But I only know about that what I've seen in the paper.[1]

Speaker in audience: Is it not true that it is possible for a congressman to submit things from the *Congressional Record* which he, in fact, did not have the time or the interest or the inclination to say in front of Congress; but merely for the people back home? And if this is true, would it not be possible for an assemblyman, for example, from our state to submit things for the *Assembly Record* on the same basis; and, therefore, submit things like the poem the woman wrote from the Los Angeles City College, which she could have had submitted to the California Assembly Record, and then in turn merely be reading from the record of the Assembly? And would not this be a way to get around some of the legislation and some of the problems which currently exist for a woman?

Dr. Louisell: I have no doubt this could be used as a subterfuge. According to the newspaper story I saw though, as I remember, the reading from the *Congressional Record* was the prayer of the Chaplain.

Speaker in audience: Well, this is probably a positive effort to approach the problem from the religion--established-religion--point of view and a particular kind of religion. I was thinking that this could also be a way to get around some of this negatively, and that it could be a problem if a person with a negative moral point of view attempted to subject a class or a group of people to his point of view.

Dr. Louisell: I suppose it is possible that that could be the objective and that one could operate by methods of subterfuge to achieve that objective.

Speaker in audience: Dr. Louisell, concerning this whole issue of morals being taught in class, why is it that they couldn't start a system by which morals could be discussed without an "indoctrination process" so that students, since they are becoming more and more knowledgable about the social conditions that exist in this country and in the world, would be made aware of the change in morals and in the religious and political aspects of life?

Dr. Louisell: I think your basic point is well taken. Certainly higher education, as I conceive it isn't in any aspect totally apart from the impingements of religion and theology and their growth and development. And I think that thought underlies much of the thinking of at least several of the Justices of the Supreme Court in pointing out that they are not condemning, in any way, educational consideration of religion that is founded upon the same type of scholarship and inquiry that characterize anything else appropriate to education.

---

[1] Recently the United States Supreme Court declined review of *Board of Education of Netcong vs. State Board of Education*, where the New Jersey Supreme Court held that a voluntary pre-school-hours prayer program violated the First Amendment, 39 Law Week 3437, two justices dissenting.

Speaker in audience: Well then, also, couldn't they start discussing this at the secondary level in classes that a person does not have to attend; but, let's say, with that first step, it could evolve into the lower grades of education. That, I think would be better than there to be legal hang-ups involved with the whole issue.

Dr. Louisell: I think we are increasingly going to recognize concerning problems of values, basic to our very survival, that the legal hang-ups that you're referring to just simply won't indefinitely be hang-ups even for elementary education. And I don't think, certainly as far as the First Amendment is concerned, that there is any intention to keep out the kind of discussion and teaching that you are referring to, even from the elementary schools. What there is an intention to prevent is the practice of religion in the sense of devotion in the public elementary schools, unless perhaps it be done purely voluntarily That's another question.

Speaker in audience: But I get the impression that because of the legal issues we are not letting a person be presented with the facts in school to draw his own conclusions

Dr. Louisell: I certainly agree that we have gotten so involved with the legalisms of the situation that the primary thing is too much subordinated--look at the time I spend here talking about legal cases Your primary problem is not the negative problem. Your primary problem is how to do the job affirmatively and positively. How can you do it fairly? The negative problem of the law's inhibitions is in that sense really secondary to your primary purpose and problem.

SECOND SESSION

"Purposes and Priorities for the Seventies," by the Reverend Dr. Gerald H. Kennedy, Bishop, Los Angeles Area of the United Methodist Church; trustee of a number of institutions of higher education; from 1961 to 1968 a member of the California State Board of Education.

I am honored to be here, and I have to confess right off that I know very little about education; and I'm not very anxious to learn any more than I know. I have always thought it was a very dull subject and never wanted to spend any more time than was necessary in the courses I took in education. I certainly am no expert in this field. Everybody here has forgotten more about education than I ever knew.

But I do have some small competence, perhaps, that enables me to speak to you. For one thing, I am a graduate of a junior college, Modesto.

There was a fellow sometime ago--I think his name was Taylor--and he was a Senator from Idaho--who was testifying before a commission about banking. They asked him if he had ever been an officer in a bank, and he said, "No." Had he ever been a president of a bank? "No." "Well then, how can you testify," they asked, "with any authority?" He said he was a depositor.

I am a former student of a junior college and owe the junior college a great deal. In fact Doctor Morris' father was Dean of the junior college where I attended, and I remember very clearly some of the great things he said in those days.

It has been mentioned that I served eight years on the State Board of Education. Part of that time junior colleges were under our administration. I enjoyed the first years on that Board. It was a great Board. I think it was the greatest Board I ever served on.

Everybody was alive and fairly liberal, and they were looking at this thing from a standpoint that I thoroughly appreciated. And then we elected Mr. Rafferty, and Mr. Reagan started making his appointments. And the last part of my time there was far from an enjoyable experience for me. I couldn't wait to get off. And being very sure in any case that Governor Reagan would not reappoint me, I wrote and said that I was through. My years were up, but I consider it a very great experience. I learned a lot from it, and I came to an amazing conclusion that dealing with the problems of education in the State of California is very similar to dealing with the problems of the Methodist Church of Southern California. The two things run parallel, and there are very great similarities. Now tonight I am to talk to you about priorities and purposes.

I want to begin with a quotation from Arnold Toynbee. I read Toynbee when I was just a young preacher in Palo Alto in the early 1940's. I bought those six volumes, or four--whatever it was--those big volumes first published, and took them with me on my holiday one summer and read every word of them. I think I'm the only fellow who has read all those volumes. I read them. And I came to have a great admiration for Arnold Toynbee. Instead of looking upon civilization in terms of technology, he moves almost directly into the idea that this is a secondary thing. A civilization is not to be judged by its technology.

Then I was in Europe in 1950 on the seminar that Sherwood Eddy used to take with fifty men and women, and I heard Toynbee in person. I will never forget that experience. He sat there and talked to us, and when the questions were raised, I had the feeling that God was talking, because Toynbee wasn't at all interested in the headlines. They didn't mean anything. I thought they did. The Korean War was on, but he, with his great understanding and long background, would point out this--that this is what's important, this is where we are going.

So in 1969 he published a book which is semi-autobiographical, and this is the one place he said this, and this impressed me very much. He said, "I have never made the choice between being an historian in politics, economics, religions, the arts, science, or technology. My conscious and deliberate aim has been to be a student of human affairs studied as a whole. I have rebelled against there being partitions into the so-called disciplines. And taking this line, I hope I have jumped clear out of the 18th century into the 21st, without getting my feet entangled in the 19th century or the 20th. I feel confident that the tradition of the past is also the ways of the future. We are now moving into a chapter of human history in which our choice is going to be not between a whole world and a shredded up world, but between one world and no world." Now this is what I like in Toynbee: "I believe that the human race is going to choose life and good, not death and evil."

Now, that is simply a statement of faith from a man who had the background. To me it's a very important statement of faith, and I begin with that tonight as a background of what I want to say to you. First of all let's take a hasty glance at this present situation you have all been thinking about and talking about. It is not a very good time in some ways. In fact I suppose most college presidents would say it is a very bad time. We are in the midst of a revolution. Everything in revolution. Walter O'Malley some time ago said that baseball would have a bad time. It's part of the establishment, and anything that is part of the establishment is in for trouble. It's a black revolution, long overdue. One hundred years is too long to wait for the promises of the Constitution to be fulfilled. Having waited too long and finally beginning to move in that direction, we have done it under pressure, and the revolution that comes about late sometimes goes too far in some ways, in my judgment. But it's a good thing, a wonderful thing. And I think that we ought to rejoice that we live in a time when we are being challenged and in some ways being forced to create the best society we have ever had. We should have done it earlier. It's a revolution of the poor.

Now I was poor. I was the poorest kid you ever saw. I have to confess the reason I went to junior college was because I was so poor I could only last one semester at the University of the Pacific. I either had to drop out altogether or go to the junior college; and I went to junior college. We didn't revolt against it, much; my father assumed that we were poor, and we had to work out of it.

But we have come to a situation which has a lot of truth in it. A society that is as affluent as ours has to make some provision for young people who are born of poor families. For a society must make sure that its youth are not cut off from the opportunities which are open to the rich.

It's a revolution of the young I don't know just how much this is really a matter of doing the thing that everybody is doing, but university students are in revolt against educational systems; and they are awake and alert to things which I think my generation didn't pay any attention to or didn't realize they ought to ask questions about. It's better now.

The hippy revolution? We came from Los Angeles today and drove up Highway 1. And the Big Sur country is full of hippies. They all want a ride somewhere apparently, and I was very impressed with that. Some of this hippy revolution, I think, is brought about by bored youngsters who didn't get into the Second World War, don't know anything about the depression. They have been fairly well off, and they are bored with our way of life and the standards which we have held up. Some of them are Peter Pans, putting on old army jackets and old costumes, trying to make life an eternal masquerade without very much involvement. But some of them have a sure sense of values which we do not believe in and do not hold up, and they want something different.

Now what caused this just now, I don't know. You fellows will know, some of you what makes these things all happen at once. What brought fifty-five men together to write the Constitution? What caused the Renaissance? What does God do? (I speak as a bishop now.) Whence come these particular seasons and sessions? Suddenly there is leadership, and there are causes, and things happen, and the top blows off, and mankind is alive again and on the march again. I don't know what caused it, but we are now in the midst of a revolution against those who would destroy our environment There is a good one. I don't know whether you read that article by John Fisher. It was in Harper's some time ago: "Survival University." Fisher says we need around the university something to give it meaning, to hold it together The church did that at one time. Theology was that thing in the Middle Ages. He says now the thing that will do this is just the sheer need for survival. Can we do something about our poisoned air, our polluted water? Can we learn how to take account of what's gained and what's lost?

Take the strip mining in Kentucky, West Virginia. Why do they do it? Why, because it pays. They can prove it by their accounting system. And then, he says, when this happens, some of the people who are still left lose their land. They go to the cities and somebody has to take care of them. They have lost their nerve. They have been beaten down long enough. And down below the water comes and floods the river and you have to build great embankments along rivers to keep from flooding the town. Who pays for those? Not the mining companies. And he says we have to have a university where the central theme will be "How Shall We Survive?" And some of these things will become clear to us.

This foolish bookkeeping we're guilty of! There's a great part to this, a very great part. This revolution, on the whole it's good.

Now I have an opportunity that most of you don't have; I baptize babies once in a while I don't suppose most of you do It's a great thrill to me The parents bring a baby to the church I take it in my arms, and I put some water on its head, and I repeat some words which accepts that child into the church's life and makes the church promise, too, they will be partly responsible for bringing up that child But I never go through an experience like that but I hate to give the baby back You look at the little fellow or that little girl and you say, "I wonder what God's going to do with this." Brand new. No limit, the possibilities that can come out of this And I say to myself, "Here is the future Here is tomorrow."

Now when you're dealing with education, especially junior college, that's what you deal with--tomorrow, the future We get invaded each year with a great new chance, new life. And this revolution students are mixed up in now, too, it's great! A lot of things are happening that wouldn't have happened if we hadn't had this revolution It's a great thing, and you're in the middle of it.

I pity you fellows sometimes, you deans, and so on I even pray for you because I think to myself, when things are going tough for me, "What if I were a college president?" Then I feel better And I don't think anything's quite so bad down where I'm working as it might be if I were a college president. But let me say this: it is a lot better than being at Leisure World A lot better to be in the middle of it And I call your attention to this, these three things. One thing, it is important, the thing you're doing. Teaching is important Schools are important Colleges are important. The second thing. It is exciting, if you can learn to live with it and not let your blood pressure get out of control altogether And the third thing, this is where the action is now--it's on the college campuses!

We used to wisecrack years ago, a fellow wanted to teach because he didn't want to be out in the middle of the thing If he wanted to be out where the action was, he didn't go to a university, he didn't go to a college to teach. That was safe No more! That's exactly where things are happening; that's exactly where tomorrow is being decided And so I don't feel so sorry for you as I thought I did It's a really great thing that you deal with this

I wonder if any of you remember a cartoon--you'd have to see it reprinted, it came out in 1909--it was a famous cartoon by Webster This was the 100th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln And he shows two Kentucky woodsmen. They met on a snowy trail, and one says to the other, "What's happening in the village?" And the other one says, "Well, the Squire's gone to Washington to see Madison swore in, and I hear that this fellow, Napoleon, has conquered most of France What's happening with you?" "Oh," the other says, "in our village nothing ever happens I did hear they got a new baby over at Tom Lincoln's, but nothing ever happens."

Well! I am trying to bring you some comfort, because I think that at the end of the day you're at the place where the decisions are being made and where tomorrow is being born; and that is great!

Now, the second thing I wanted to do tonight is talk to you a little bit about faith And you're going to say that's a religious word, and it sure is; and it's a scientific word, and it's a business word, and it's an economic word. Better say it's a word of life. Faith! We live by faith. The Bible says we're saved by faith. You can't live ten minutes on what you can prove. No matter what field you're in, you live by faith.

What do you believe? One of the best definitions I've had of this subject--I got it when I was in Pacific School of Religion as a student. Kirsopp Blake, who was a great teacher at the end of the 19th century and on into the 20th century, I think his dates were, defined faith this way. He said, "Faith is not belief in spite of evidence; it is life lived in scorn of consequence." That's almost as good as St. Paul. Great definition!

Not belief in spite of evidence, but life lived in scorn of consequence. What do you hold as the thing you're going to respond to? What do you say yes to? Your faith. Now a civilization is judged by its faith, not its technology. I spoke of this a moment ago. And so Toynbee said the main thing about Western Civilization was its religion, which, happens to be Christianity, its primary religion. That's the thing that counts, because it's what it believes that determines its future; and when it runs down, it's lost its faith. Every great age is an age of faith. Every poor age is an age of doubt and cynicism. Nothing comes from it. Nothing grows out of it. The great periods have been the ages of faith. The nation--now I don't know how you define America. I believe with all my heart it's primarily a dream, a faith, a hope. I ran across the other day this word from Chaeau who was a French statesman at the beginning of the American Revolution. Listen to what he said: "All right-thinking men must pray that this people may arrive at all the prosperity of which they are capable. They are the hope of the human race. They must prove to the world the fact that men can be both free and peaceful." That's what the Frenchman thought at the beginning of America. And now I look at our political leadership, and I get awfully discouraged.

I don't know that this has been untrue before altogether, but there has never been a time, it seems to me, when we have decided so unashamedly, when we have decided to package and sell a candidate, turn him over to a public relations firm and have it sell him to the public, as right now. And when you see what we get from that process, you begin to wonder if a democracy can exist for any length of time if it's going to make its political leadership not stand on principles which it announces, but simply on an image which some clever firm has created. And when I remember that we get what we deserve, politically, I get awfully low in my mind. Do we deserve this? We can't be this bad, can we? [Applause]

There is where we are at the present time in my judgment. And the thing runs down, the faith dies, and the dream is gone. The hope is no longer with us. And this is the serious thing about America right now, not the gross national product or the taxation policies or anything else.

Now the church comes into this too. The church is having a bad time, if you fellows don't know it, you're not in it. But it's having a bad time. Not everybody's going to church. It's just like it was when I started my ministry. You know these things come and go. People get too excited about temporary situations. People talk about the death of the church. When I began my ministry you could'nt get many people to come to church. When people knew I was going to be a minister, they did'nt think I was very bright. They looked down their noses. It isn't very different now. It's not as easy as it was a few years ago when everybody was going to church--open the doors and everybody came. But now we're rather desperate because we wonder what the answer is. So we're trying to find some new gadget. That isn't the trouble with it. The church has lost its faith. It doesn't hold up what it believes. It doesn't really believe it any more. All those people who joined the church because it was the thing to do, they've gone; and here we are having to come to terms with what we are and what God has done for us and what He is trying to say to us through the Gospel. Do we believe it, or don't we? And it's hard going. No gadget is going to save us. I go to these meetings of the church, and I come away feeling worse than when I went because they've got some trick. It won't work.

Now we look at education. This is our common American creed. We believe in education. This was universal, practically. All our subjects, all our topics, all our problems would be dealt with adequately. If you got people educated, they would do the right thing. They'd always be polite. They'd be ladies and gentlemen. They wouldn't revolt.

But you never can be sure of what they'll do when they're educated. All we know is that we trust people who act from knowledge rather than from prejudice, and our future we risk on that creed. Now we're not so sure about this thing. We wonder what this education's leading us to and where it is going and why there are so many of these radical students.

In the period of the 50's students weren't raising questions about anything. They seemed to have been born middle-aged. And you didn't have any revolt on the campus, and you didn't have any radicals around. And a man made a great speech in which he said, "These students, this generation of students, will please their employers very much." That fellow's name was Clark Kerr. I don't know whether he has ever looked back at the speech or not. That's what he said then. And suddenly it had changed. But it is better this way as we face this revolutionary generation, and will face many more, then it was then, much better.

Now I read a book the other day written by a University of California professor and written in professional language, so I didn't understand much of it. He's a scientist, and he's a smart fellow. His name is Stent, S-t-e-n-t. The subject of the book was The Coming of the Golden Age. I didn't understand the first part, because he makes an analogy of his own discipline, which is biology; and it's very complicated, I think. But the main point that he was coming to was this: the "golden age" is not the beginning of a period, it's the end of it, the end. And whenever you come into a golden age, when everybody is prosperous, and everything seems well, you aren't starting anything, you're ending it. It's the death sign, not the birth sign of a generation. And he went on to say that's where we are now. We're at the end, end of progress. He didn't convince me of that, but at least I did get this idea, and I believe it's true: when everything is smooth and everything is prosperous, that's the end, not the beginning.

Now I say this word very tenderly, and I hope you will forgive me: education, I think, deserves a lot of the criticism that's being hurled against it, the

A fellow came over to see me the other day from Arizona--that's a part of my responsibility, Arizona--and he said in Tucson he had seen an Indian driving a car, and on the car was this bumper sticker: "Custer had it coming to him." And I want to say to you tonight, education has it coming to it. If there has ever been a reactionary setup in our society, it is education. More reactionary than the church ever was. And having gone through a good many schools--I went to school for twenty years--I knew if I was going to have a chance at all in this world, I had to get all I could get--I tell you it's about time somebody asked some questions about some educational establishments and blew the windows open and let some fresh air in. And if I understand anything that these students are saying and doing, it's about this. I'm for them.

Now the fellow that has to administer an institution is always in trouble. He's always had a tough situation, and one of the best articles I ever read was written by John Gardner, you know, formerly H.E.W. administrator, a great man, formerly president of Carnegie Corporation. He wrote an article on how to prevent organizational dry rot, and I copied down the nine points he made, and I give them to you.

He says, first, you must have an effective program for the recruitment and the development of talent. Education needs that, not too close in on where you are, on the status quo.

He says, too, you must have a hospitable environment for the individual. Now I don't know what all that row has been about at San Francisco State, but part of it, I'm convinced, at least at Cal, was students who were tired of being treated as cyphers. There wasn't a hospitable environment for the individual there.

He says, third, you must have built-in provisions for self-criticism. Awfully hard for a fellow to listen gladly to criticism from people who haven't had the experience he's had. The Turkish proverb has it this way: The man who tells the truth should have one foot in the stirrup. And that is about right with most of our institutions, if you are going to criticize them. He says you have got to have a system that is wide open with opportunities for that.

Four, it has to have an internal structure that is fluid. Our structure got so hard and tight that there's no give in them, and they can't change, they can't grow.

Five, he says watch the internal communications. Be sure that those of you that are in it know what you are after, and know what the main purpose of it is.

Six, prevent men from becoming prisoners of their procedures. Oh, boy! I know about that in the church! I know about that! I will give you an example. The Methodist church is going to have a special general conference in April. We don't need it any more than I need another neck. It costs us three quarters of a million dollars. So we tried to find some way to take some kind of a vote to see if the fellows really wanted it. And our Judicial Council said you can't take that vote, because they have to be there personally to vote. So we have got to have the meeting because we don't know any way to call it off. That's what I call becoming a prisoner of your procedures.

Seven, you must have protection against the vested interest. The minute a fellow gets to be a part of the established organization, he has a vested interest. And he doesn't want any question to come along, or any revolt that will upset that too much. I speak from personal experience because I am part of the bureaucracy, and I know how that works.

Eight, keep your eye on what we are to become and not what we have been. Don't look back too much. Look forward, which will mean, I think, you will not be afraid of a new idea even if it sounds foolish.

And the ninth one was morale. Men must believe that it makes a difference whether they do well or badly. That idea, morale--now sometimes I think that is the main thing that a president of an institution can yield, can share. Men have to have their morale kept up. C. P. Snow was a great fellow--is a great fellow. He's still alive. He writes first-rate novels, most of which I have read; but he is a scientist. He wrote that wonderful long essay, "The Two Cultures." You all know about it. He says it is important that an institution have the future in its bones. The future. And that's what the church ought to have. And, believe me, that's what education has got to have, the future in its bones, the sense of tomorrow. And this is up to administrators, teachers, and students.

Now I want to say one final thing to you. When it comes to priorities, I have a very great--some people call it prejudice, I don't think it is--the priority has to be the teacher. If I could begin tonight to say something to you to tell you how much teachers have meant to me, you would have some reason to know why I say this.

When I was on the Board of Education, I never thought that we were dealing with the real problems, because we weren't dealing with teachers very often. Once in a while a teacher would come in to tell us about something that was going on, and then my heart would rise up, and I would say, "Ah, this is it. This is it." And all this Board of Education, all these deans, and all these officers--all they're good for is to help that fellow in his classroom do his work. And if they are not doing that, they ought to be eliminated.

Yes, that is all we are: servants, those of us who are in administration, servants of the teachers; servants of the preachers in my case. If I can't help him do a better job, then I ought to be fired.

Jacque Barzun wrote a book in 1945--I looked it up the other day on my shelf. I have had it all these years, and it's been a great mind book for me--Teacher in America. Too long ago for you to want to read, I suppose--but he's a fellow who says, "Don't talk about education. That isn't important. Talk about teaching. What happens in that classroom when you have a real teacher?"

Well, my teaching, my experience in this field began with teachers in junior college when Jum Morris was a dean. Jum Morris made a speech. We met in the basement. We just started that thing [junior college]. I was in one of the early classes. We met in the basement because that was the only place we could meet. He stood before us one day and said, "I know that some of you wanted to go to other colleges. You wanted to go to universities. You wanted to go to some place where they have traditions But," he said, "have you ever thought that it's a greater thing for you to set the traditions?" I had great teachers in that place I think of a historian named Koch, and I think of a fellow who taught logic named Fuller I never had better teachers than those people. I think of those teachers I have known, a few of them all through my life. I've had a half dozen great teachers. You know a fellow doesn't deserve more than one I've had a half dozen or more And when I look back upon that whole business where I went to school and what their theory was, none of that made an impression on me; but when I met a great person that opened my mind to something that I hadn't seen and made me want something I didn't have, that fellow I never forgot He was a great teacher Now the trouble is there aren't very many of them. Queen Victoria went to church one Sunday and didn't hear a very good sermon; and when she came back, she said to her prime minister, Lord Melbourne, "There aren't many good preachers." And he said, "Madam, there aren't many good anything " I suppose that's true--not very many good doctors and an awful lot of quacks, not very many good lawyers and a lot of shysters, not many good preachers. How many good teachers? Not many. But, oh, thank God for those few great ones when they come along.

Now an educational institution or organization has got to realize this and encourage teaching in every way it can

We need to be saved in this day from shoddiness--shoddy work! You get stuck with your car Try to find a fellow who knows about cars! They have more butchers in these garages that ought to be doing anything except working on machinery. Try to find first-rate men anywhere. And so I read the other day, that Gardener says, "An excellent plumber is infinitely more admirable than an incompetent philosopher." Amen! Somehow we have to be cured of our willingness to settle for second-rate stuff, for shoddiness in so many fields in America. Oh, you can find it everywhere; I don't need to point it out to you, I expect. I could if you wanted me to, but I don't think that's necessary We need to bring back once again the dignity of any man's job if he doesn't go through the University to become a philosopher but goes there for an evening class or something to become a mechanic, to become a good one Now that seems to me to come right in your place. That's where you will deal with these things more than anywhere else I know And to show you now that I believe this, what I'm trying to say to you, I'm going to retire from this job just as soon as I can, at the earliest possible date, which is now 1972. And as soon as I retire from this job, I'm going to become a pastor again, because I have learned in the church that anything that's done that counts for anything is done in a local church by a pastor as he works with his people. I want to go back there. And I am sure in my own mind that all that ever happens or really counts happens in a relationship between teacher and student That's the top priority--teachers.

And so I close by quoting something I ran across a long time ago. My wife and I went to England just after I got out of school, and I found an inscription written on an old church in England. I've seen it many times since then, too. I want to read it to you!

"In the year 1653 when all things sacred were throughout the nation either demolished or profaned (we think that's happening to us sometimes), Sir Robert Shirley, Baronet, founded this church, whose singular praise it is to have done the best things in the worst times and hoped for them in the most calamitous." Isn't that great!

And it seems to me that this is the task of teachers and administrations and all those who work with education: to get the priorities right and never lose sight of the purposes, in the worst times especially, to do the best thing.

Well, thank you for letting me come up here and talk, and Lord bless you. [Prolonged applause.]

Questions and Answers following Bishop Kennedy's Speech

Student in audience: When you were talking about your priorities as far as education is concerned, you said that it lies with the teachers. Were you trying to say that the student should be stimulated to search for knowledge, or did you have in mind the idea of teaching him that which is categorized as knowledge for him to regurgitate?

Bishop Kennedy: Now, I was telling about the great teachers out of my own experience who gave me some things that I saw clearly that I wanted to explore, to find, some purposes, some ideas--not giving just things you write down in a notebook to give back in an examination. I think that's what you're worried about, isn't it? Yes. I didn't mean that, surely not.

Teacher in audience: Bishop Kennedy, you said what a people believes determines its future? There seems to be a good deal of disenchantment on the part of young people from the experiences of the Jews in Germany. They had a great faith, not only a religious faith, but also an intellectual faith, that what the Germans eventually did to them was impossible to happen. I think this has a good deal to do with the fact that young people have been turned off by formal religion. Can you comment on that?

Bishop Kennedy: I follow you. If I understand you, Christian Germany turned to Nazism. That's what you are concerned about. Yes. Well, all you can say about that is you're never safe. We always work on a narrow edge. It could happen here; it could happen anywhere. The Jews through the years have come down as such a great people because they've been through not only that, but many similar experiences; and they have believed that above the whole thing there is a Power--that the injustice of man wasn't the final word. When I read back on that thing and look at it, I have a hard time adjusting myself to it, such a horrible thing. We ought not to forget it, either.

But when you go to Israel and see what's come up out of that people now and what they are doing to the land and recovering their sense of purpose and the rest of it, I don't think you have to say the final defeat was put upon the Jews by Hitler or anybody else. I think the Jew is a perfect example of great faith, that gets defeated at times, but not ultimately and finally.

Student in audience: I would like you to comment on this. I see the church and the educational institution as having in a way the same problem, that both don't relate to the people as much as they should. The administrators, the teachers, and, as you said in your administrative capacity, you wanted to relate to helping the teacher to do his job; but I feel that they relate more to the status quo of, say, the ruling class, and I see this as a problem because it tends to alienate the student from striving for total education in the concept of that education is all around you. The school is just, to me personally, a very small part of it, and we in a way are conditioned to strive for success in this day and age and not for total education. And I think this is one of the problems. Could you comment on that?

Bishop Kennedy: Yes, I see: and you have made a very good point. Of course it's true that the church and education are limited, and the people they speak to and the people they speak for, and they are under more control than they ought to be of certain powerful people. Every church is. But the amazing thing to me is that it's always been this way; and yet, the church--I'll go back earlier than that. I'll go back to the seventh centurey, B.C , where you had Amos come on the scene out of the established religion of the time to speak his word, which nobody wanted to hear. But the prophet, the prophetic strain, is a witness that the religious institutions, while often times it stones its prophets, continues to produce them. And so, there is hope for us in that these men didn't speak for the institution but spoke against it. And the good preacher is always doing that. Now he faces a situation where he has to bring his people along in some case, especially if he isn't a Methodist, where I can protect him. But otherwise he has to be careful he doesn't get bawled out. And many a church is under that mistake of listening to men who carry influence and who are well-to-do; and sometimes it becomes just reflections of that. That is certainly true. I hope it isn't true of the church in general, and I think you'll find this a very hard job. You're part of the establishment. You are an institution. But you have to also be speaking the word of the future and speaking to the poor. Now, we haven't done as well as we should. No church has. I think we've done it better than any other institution has done it. And I think that in America, in the days past, I have thought that a Democratic institution certainly was a public school where a kid came to learn, no matter who his parents were or how old or whether he was rich or poor, and had his chance there to find his way. And I think that's still probably true in terms of the whole society in which we live. These two institutions hold up to the world more clearly than any other institutions I know, what we ought to be and what we ought to do; not as much as we should, not as good as we ought to be, I grant you.

Student in audience: You've spoken about education very well, and I am wondering, how do you stimulate a rather impassive student body to respond to the educational system?

Bishop Kennedy: I am not sure I heard the last thing you said. The student body?

Student: Yes, the students themselves.

Bishop Kennedy: Yes, the students themselves. That they do or they don't or they should, or what?

Student. To stimulate the students who are more or less impassive.

Bishop Kennedy: Yes. Well, right now I think most people would think they don't need any stimulation [Laughter.] But if they ever get passive, they need to be stimulated; this is true. I don't know. I suppose a student can go to a school, and just like any citizen he may respond or not respond. He may be this or that, and some of them never will respond, I suppose. They are not that kind of people. But the student body that's alert and alive under good leadership--they elect their leaders, don't they? They still do that, don't they? I think they still do, student body president, and so on--will be always confronted with these, and the teacher will do this if he is doing his job, confront them with the real issues which we are facing and what it means to be alive in this kind of a situation and what they ought to be doing.

Student in audience: Bishop Kennedy, you mentioned several times the establishment; you mentioned the Hippy Movement, and how some of them are sincere. I often think that they are dissatisfied with the society they live in; and yet they also seem to turn their back, not only on the educational institutions, but the religious institutions. And I have noticed also that you don't see many people with long hair in church anymore, at least, I don't. So, I want to get your view on just exactly what type of a situation we are in as far as the church compared to education.

Bishop Kennedy: Yes. Well, it's a tough situation for us both at the present time. That's certainly true. I think the criticism we have a right to make of the hippies is that too often they are not involved. They have no intention of being involved. They've just dropped out. They want no part of anything. Now that's a possible attitude to take where society is so bad that you can't do much about it. You're not going to try, and you drop out of it. But I think the people that set the future are those who know that we operate through institutions. You cannot eliminate institutions. Society operates through them. When I hear a fellow say, "I believe in Christianity, but I don't like the church," I feel like saying, "Well, Brother, you wouldn't know anything about Christianity if it weren't for the church. And it's your job to change the institution and the establishment, but you better be in it and playing a part in it." That's my belief, my feeling about it. If you just drop out and say, "I'll have nothing to do with any of it," well, I can't do anything about that. You can do it, but you're not going to possess a future in any way. You're not going to change the future. I think it's probably true--we don't have very many hippies in church. I don't see them when I preach; but the church should be friendly to the hippy, because in some ways he is the original Christian. He is a fellow who eliminates all this stuff and just loves people. He's a "flower child," and I expect in the first century that a good many people thought of Christians in that way. They said they were immoral. They didn't believe in war, didn't believe in society, didn't take responsibility. They backed out of it. [Applause.] We have a lot in common, I think; although the hippies sometimes don't realize it.

Student in audience: What happens when you confront the predominant institutions--the church, the government, the educational institutions? You try to get involved in some of them; and you become alienated, cynical, loss of faith, and the dream. Where do you go? Where do you start over again to get your faith back and to get the dream back?

Bishop Kennedy: Well, I know where I think you can do it. If you find the right church, I think you could find it there. It's a kind of a religious faith you have got to have to find it; but you probably don't want to take that step. I guess you just have to find out for yourself and fool around until finally you decide that maybe it's this way or that. You may find some man, some person, that can restore it for you, some movement somewhere that'll help you get what you want. For example my heart goes out to all the young men about this war. I couldn't participate in it. I think it's the biggest fool thing we ever did. No moral reason for it. I think it's a great blunder. You won't all agree with me, but there it is. [Laughter.] I don't know what I'd do about this. I've said to young men who've talked with me about this, "I'm sure with you on this. I can't see any reason for it all." As I get the reports from the college, this is becoming a rather predominant idea; they're going to sit this one out, no matter what it costs, one way or another. That's a very hopeful thing for the long future. It's tough for the fellow who gets caught on it. But this means that, in a way I don't think has been true in my lifetime, a younger generation is standing up and saying "No. Nothing doing!" And that's great! That's wonderful! I learned this--I went out to Claremont Colleges on October 15th and made a speech. I got some letters from some of my people, sixty-five or seventy years old, most of them, questioning my patriotism and my right to say anything against the government and my right to go against President Nixon. You know we've got a new philosophy; it isn't my country right or wrong; it's my President right or wrong. There isn't that much difference between those two philosophies in my judgment. But the thing that thrills me about this whole business is this rising protest across the nation on the part of students. You're the fellows that have to fight the war; you're the fellows that go over there and die. These seventy-year-olds, they can express themselves, but their expression doesn't carry any weight with me. They're not going to go, they're not in it. But when students rise up and say this thing, somebody listens, even Mr. Nixon listens. He said he wouldn't, but I believe he does. I don't see how he could [Laughter.] keep from it. This is good, isn't it? I think this is wonderful! This is the coming of age of a new generation that's going to make some decisions themselves and going to decide whether a thing is right or wrong; and the Pentagon and those fellows are going to have to watch their step a lot closer than they have in the past. So I don't find anything here to get discouraged about. I want to stand up and cheer. I don't think I answered your question, but I didn't know how to. [Laughter.]

Student in audience: I'm an activist at college. I have a two-part question. When you spoke of faith, I liked your definition; but I hope you didn't mean the kind of faith that Mr. Agnew or Mr. Nixon would do--blind faith. I'd like you to expound a little more on faith. And second of all, concerning the established church, what are your views--and I hope I don't get the name wrong--on the grass-roots movement concerning St. Basil's Church in Los Angeles?

Bishop Kennedy: Ah, yes. St. Basil's. Is that where the brown revolt was the other night? Yes. Well, I thought it was great. I don't think Cardinal McIntyre did. [Laughter.]

I have to say this about Cardinal McIntyre. I want you to know, those of you who come from the South--now we have a Cardinal in Los Angeles who is not a flaming liberal; [Laughter.] but he's a wonderful man. I think he's one of my friends. I'm very fond of him. I do think that the Catholic Church ought to have some kind of regulation where a fellow retires before he gets to be eighty-five. That's the problem. It's a matter of mechanics. Now I think that was good. I can't see how they could have done anything else. I thought they did it with pretty good taste. Of course it was on television, and they knew that. But how do you get through, you know, and make yourself, your feelings felt? Now you had a first part. What was the first part? It was about faith. A little more on that faith. Let me go back for just one second to St. Paul. When St. Paul talks about being saved by faith, he doesn't mean you're saved by what you believe. That's a mistake a lot of religious people make. He means you're saved when you say yes to God and God's revelation in Christ. I'm talking religion now, and I beg your pardon, fellows; this is an educational meeting and I'm not sure this is lawful. [Laughter and applause.] But Paul's idea was that when you're saved by faith, you're saved by responding to what God has done for you and to you, and you go that way. It's not a matter of belief. And so when I talk about a civilization's faith or a nation, society, it's where it's going, it's what it's risking for a future thing that it believes in. And if I may get back to the Jew, that was the thing that always saved him, saved by his religion, faith in God, no matter how bad life was, Hitler or the rest of them, that wasn't the last word, bad as it was, the holocaust! And they've been carried through this long, long, great story. Oh, I tell you, the Jew's the greatest fellow in the world! You read his story. Who was that man a while back, long time ago, who said "Do I believe in God? Of course I do. Why? Because of the Jew." He taught us this thing by his death, and all his suffering and all the rest of it--saved by faith, that beyond this thing there's something to which he's going to be loyal. Well, I must quit, I'll have a sermon going here.

Student in Audience: I believe that I heard you draw a parallel between the newborn infant and the junior college freshman. Does that, then, equal the parallel between the parent and the junior college instructor? Could you elaborate on this? [Laughter.]

Bishop Kennedy: I'm always scared to death of carrying an analogy too far. I think I'm going to get off right here. I was only throwing out in a general way that when you deal with young people you're dealing with the future.

Teacher in audience: First of all, there's a couple of things that you mentioned about students that I just thought I would say. Look at the student ratio that's been up here compared to teachers. I think it's a fine thing. I wanted you to comment on something that I've done. I teach political science and history, and I've sent students out with the disguised Bill of Rights and had them try to get people to sign it. You get about three-fourths of the society not wanting to sign the Bill of Rights for various things--it's a Communist plot and what not. So last spring I tried something different. I was teaching a Sunday School class, and we were talking about the Beatitudes: Blessed are the poor, the meek, the humble, the peacemakers, they shall inherit the earth, etc. So I disguised the Beatitudes, and I sent them out in the form of petitions with students to some thirty-odd churches in my valley. And I had them there Sunday so that when the people came out of the church on the steps, that they'd have the opportunity to hear my students ask them to read this petition on the Beatitudes and see if they would sign it. Seventy-eight percent of the people coming out of various churches of various denominations these Sundays refused to endorse the Beatitudes as the cornerstone of the Christian church. [Laughter.] Could you comment on this please? [Laughter and applause.]

Bishop Kennedy: Well, my first comment is that I'm not surprised, really. The Bible for most people is to be read, not something to sign up for or to take seriously. Same for the Bill of Rights. I think the two situations are very parallel, really. They're ideals of the past, they're things that were set up, we know, good; but to take them seriously and put our name on them particularly now, with the Bill of Rights, I know lots of people who think that's questionable. Of course, from the beginning, people have had a lot of trouble with the Sermon on the Mount. They take it really literally, and to put their name on it?--they haven't done it. That's probably the fault of the preachers. They don't say it very well, and it's one of those things that have been around a while. You hold it up, but you don't really get into it. I'm very interested in your experiment.

Speaker in audience: I want you to comment on one other thing. You talked about the new infants when you baptize them and everything, and you wonder what God's going to do with them, I was turned off from the church two or three years ago when I found out what the minister was doing and everything. [Laughter.] So I wonder really whether or not God has the chance to do anything with a lot of the infants that come into this world, when we have a society around that in a way dictates to people what they must do; and you hear the talk now that it's time to tear down the establishment and time to just replace it with something else. And I wonder if you in the ministry have any feelings on it--whether you agree with it at all.

Bishop Kennedy: Well, a lot of times I do feel--whenever I hear a fellow criticizing the church, I just thank God he doesn't know any more than what he does. [Laughter.] I could start off where he stops. If you're fed up with some of the things that have happened to you, I'd like to talk to you. But I come back to this finally: I throw this establishment out, and I put a new one in, and there's no guarantee at all that I can do it any better. Human nature changes geologically slowly. Things happen in a hurry around about us; but as far as our fundamental nature's concerned, that doesn't change very fast. It takes a long, long time; and we're up against this thing of inadequate institutions, unworthy institutions. It's true, I think we have better ones in America than anywhere else in the world, at least we have in the past. And this free enterprise of churches, this freedom of churches to start anything they want to start, there's no state church established to maintain anything that's worked pretty well; and I'm not sure we can find any better way to do it except to just continue and try to reform what's bad and go along with it. You don't let one fellow in one church have too much influence on you.

Student in audience: What I would like to ask in reference to a statement you made earlier about protection from various vested interests. I have seemed to have noticed various bumper stickers that say "Love America or Leave It"; and what I want to say it, like myself, I'm an American of Mexican descent.

And as far back as I can remember, all my life I was made to feel that I was an outsider and that somehow if I didn't like the way things were, to go back--to go back to Mexico is what they meant. Yet my people have been in California for generations. And you talked about--well, a lot of people say, "Well, look at the Italians, look at the Irish. They come over here, and they more or less have made it without having to ask for handouts." But the Mexican people in California they don't have this, shall we say, immigrant mentality where they feel that it's a new country. This has been their land; and yet they've always been shoved to the periphery of the outside of the society, never made to feel that they are part of the main stream. And what I want to ask is if you have certain elements that want to keep minorities, you know, down by saying that when they're trying to get out of the situation that they're communist inspired or radically led by various elements. The way I see it, it's a situation that will never get people together. They'll polarize people instead of getting to a common ground where people will be able to talk, because I believe in solving things in a moderate manner; because violence, as we all know, doesn't bring very much results at all. So what is your opinion on that, if I may ask?

Bishop Kennedy: Well, I am delighted that along with the black revolt, we have a brown revolt. I think the Mexican people are long overdue for this insistence upon a recognition, a dignity in right of Mexican people, Latin-American people. It's coming, and the only thing that worries me at the present time is the possibility that the revolt may cause a reaction on the part of the far right so that we can't talk. Now that is what we must prevent at all costs, that's what we're opposed to; but in my own church we have a number of Latin churches, and I am delighted that those Latin pastors have taken leadership in this and are asserting themselves. That's where it ought to be done. It's happening in the Catholic church; it's happening all around. This is good. We must not let this thing be stopped by the far right over here and the revolutionists over here, not meeting and not talking. We must prevent that. I think it can be best done in the churches and in the schools.

Representative of Campus Ministry in audience: As a member of the State Board, having left it, what do you feel are the current dangers to higher education, given our current political system?

Bishop Kennedy: Well, the State Board did deal with higher education, as you know; now we only go up to the twelfth grade. But the thing that bothers me--probably not in good taste for me to comment on it--this Board at the present time is going downhill, to put it mildly--ever since, well, before I left. The people on that Board now are the people who are pale echoes of Mr. Rafferty, God help them! God help all of us! [Laughter.] That is one of the saddest things that ever happened to education, anywhere, and it happened here. And gradually as new appointments are made by a new governor, it just goes right along on that path. The great problems of higher education, I don't know. I am not in it, and you know more about that than I do. I thought it was beating U.S.C., some one said at U.C.L.A. a few months ago. I still think they played a better game than U.S.C. did, but anyway, that's where we've been in the past. I don't know about that; it strikes me that U.C.L.A. is a great University, a liberal University, great ideas going on there; and I think they have held things under proper order, haven't blown up all together; but there's also pressure for certain changes, isn't there?

I'm just thinking as kind of an outsider. I don't know. Guess I better just leave it right there.

Speaker in audience: This is a value conference, and it's very important; because the next decade is going to be a decade of rebellion, not only on the campuses, but for the church. So what we decide here is going to be very important; also because students now are looking for new values. What is the truth? Now I know for a fact if we decide on certain values, students will not accept them, if we just take it back to the counselors, back to the campuses, and say, "Here, we set these values; follow them." Students won't do that. It will just feed the fire, and they'll rebel all the more. You have to give them a background showing why these are the right values. So when we decide what the values are and we present these values, how are we going to present that background justifying that they are the right values to follow?

Bishop Kennedy: I don't know.

Student in audience: You made your point quite clear that you believe in the student rebellion, as far as the changes go; but do you go along with the violence that has also occurred with it? And if you don't, what could be an alternate to this violence in order to get the voices of the student heard?

Bishop Kennedy: No, I certainly don't go along with the violence. I think that violence itself is self-defeating, really. I think it's the violence that may cause this thing I fear most of all, this polarization of the far right over against the revolutionists at a stand-off. I just started to read an article by Bayard Ruskin in which he talks about this black revolt; and his point is that the violence accomplished very little. In fact, he believes that violence is self-defeating in the long run. It doesn't accomplish what they want it to accomplish. I have to say this, also; there have been these rather semi-violent things that have happened that have certainly gotten some action. Now we certainly are more aware of this thing and more responsive to it, because of some of these things, which I suppose you would call violence. But I don't believe in violence for the attainment of any long-reaching purpose, long-lasting goal. I think that in the long run we are in a position in this country where if we just keep pressing forward, we can make tremendous progress. If you go down South as I do every once in a while, you will be astounded at the contrast in ten years. In the South! To say nothing of Los Angeles, or everywhere! Oh, great progress has been made. We haven't just been marking time. We have moved forward, and the only thing that can upset the whole thing is this thing that we are talking about, this polarization. So I think we ought to be opposed and ought to speak very, very strongly against violence, because of the things that have happened in these last years when violence was a part of it. Violence wasn't the central thing to all that was brought about.

Student in audience: You said earlier that you didn't believe in the college and the students and so forth, but I guess in my lifetime I have gotten the feeling that those people that are in charge, who administer the "system," they don't know what it is to be anything other than where they are. And so, therefore, they don't have to stand up necessarily for what they believe, and very seldom would they sanction anything done by someone subservient to them in whatever they are administering.

Bishop Kennedy: You are talking about administrators of colleges?

Student: I'm talking about the whole show.

Bishop Kennedy: Administration, through, on the administration level?

Student: Yes. And you know, persons like with this church. Like when you have the suppression of a people, whether they are black, brown, Indian, or whatever; and you know I just can't quite see why, like the church for instance, the church is so powerful, and has been all along that at any time in the past, when this country was conceived, and if the church had had in its mind, like, for instance, there is not going to be any racism, taking that as one, today there would not be to the degree that it is. And when I see things like as far as the war is concerned,--I mean, the church is so powerful economically, too, and it has had such a great amount of influence on the politics of the world throughout the course of history, I can't quite see why a nation such as ours should have to be at such a low degree of progression, you know. And I'd like to know what do you have to say about it. Like for instance, if you in your position, why is it that, you know, like we need people. The trouble with the United States today, especially in the area of politics, for instance, with the Pueblo and all, is that the United States seems to be too afraid to intervene, whether it be by force or by diplomatic means, so as to bring about action, you know; like not having something as small as the Pueblo incident, or anything, just kind of bring this nation down. What do you have to say about that?

Bishop Kennedy: Well, the first thing I'd say is that you think the church has more power than it has. This is a situation that I think didn't happen before. But any generation in America can close the church in one generation. All you have to do is make up your mind it's not worth while or that it's saying the wrong thing. It's a free situation. It exists simply by the free-will support, the free-will offering of its people. As for the United States, now, using your example of the Pueblo, there was much more at stake in that thing than the Pueblo. This was the kind of whirl where the wrong decision here, and the wrong thing down there, could have set off a holocaust. And we had people who were in charge who were aware of that thing, and they went easy. And when you're as strong as America is, then you are under double necessity of being very careful how you use your strength.

Same student: Yeah, but isn't it also true that the amount of survival, the necessity to survive, is within you? It's also within the other person. I think that throughout history the United States could have been more aggressive at using tact, you know, at times than it has been. And it just seems like ridiculous that, you know, that it should have to police the world. But at the same time, you know, if something comes up, we have to kind of walk softly you know. I think we dropped that big stick bit President Wilson talked about--.

Bishop Kennedy: Yes, but the time has come, you see, when a small nation with a world opinion behind it, which it can get, carries an awful lot of wallop, very great influence; and powerful nations just can't move in and do these things the way it once was assumed they could. I think the time has come when the big stick has to be used particularly softly and warily.

Same student: O.K. I have one more point. I have talked to a lot of people of your generation, and you know, they seem to be, they're the type that like George Putnam, you know, and they settle down and--

Bishop Kennedy: Don't put me in there.

Same student: It's, say, well, like you know, I work with people, you know; so I get into various conversations with them. And I might ask them, "Well, what do you think about the contemporary revolution?" You know, and then we start working down to specifics, you know, and they seem to think that, well, as far as black people are concerned, the revolution is doing them more harm than good. Violence gets no one anywhere, etc., you know; and I see after various movements that more action is done in twenty-four hours to a month than has been done in years up to that time. And, no one is--and I can't agree, and I'm not a dissident, I don't want anyone to get me wrong. But I see a lot coming about through violence because of the establishment's fright of having the revolution completely oust them, you know. And I can't see where like a person will say, "Well, I think that they should go through procedural means, you know, to get whatever they want." You know, I can't see why anyone can't get what they want through asking for it and everything; you know, like the black man, and the Indian, and the Chicano, they are telling you, "Well, we shouldn't have to ask for something that is already ours to start with." You know, like those inalienable rights that they talk about in the Constitution was thought up for, 400 years you know; and you wonder about these types of things. And I have always been one to maintain, you know, like I had this customer the other day. She says, you know "Well, black people they don't have to riot and tear up and loot and everything like that," you know. And I said, "Well if we didn't have to do that, and we have a Constitution and a Bill of Rights that state quite clearly that which is ours; but yet when we came to this country, against our will, and we weren't a part of that soup that was in the melting pot, you know; this is the type of thing that kinda gets me, especially when I'm talking and she tells me afterwards that she's patriotic. And I told her, "I'm more patriotic than you," you know. I mean like I like to think of the United States as a great place. I'd rather be nowhere else. But rather than keep the status quo, let's try for a change, because that's the only way the democratic system can survive. [Applause.]

Bishop Kennedy: I agree with you. I agree with you completely, with what you said there at the end. I would simply add this thing, that violence, while it gets an immediate result, oftentimes causes more of a back-up over here, and they lose more in the long run than they gain by violence. And that's why I think a good many people are saying we'd better go along and use our constitutional method.

Student in audience: I think for the benefit of everyone here, not putting you on the spot or anyone who's talked, but I've heard a couple of people come up and talk about violence. Now in a real sense what are we talking about when we say violence? What is it, if you tear something up--it's violence? I mean, from what I gathered in the church, Jesus Christ wasn't the most pacifist that walked the earth. You know, [illegible] threw water on people, and burried'em here, and threw rocks on 'em, and stuff, you know. So maybe we're doing it the right way. But what are we talking about when we're talking about violence? It is more violent to hold people down for years and years, with a real subtle type of atmosphere that they don't even know that they're being oppressed. Is this more violent than going up--I was talking to this newscaster from A.B.C., and he got all upset with me 'cause he said not to come down on Jews. You know, some of my best friends are Jews. [Laughter.] But he said a Jew has a right to be in a black community and making a living there and exploit the people and keep the kids in that community from eating. I said, "Well, then it's my right to go down the street and blow somebody's head off with a shotgun." "No, that's violence." I contend that that Jew on the corner--and not necessarily Jews; you know, if you take the Jew out and you put a black man there and he does the same thing, you know, it's still there. But this is more violent than popping somebody up the side of the head, or burning up some clothes, or running down the street and breaking a window and picking up a couch and taking it home, you know. So where's the violence?

Bishop Kennedy: Well, you're getting over into a philosophical realm when you're talking violence. What I mean by violence is murder or burning, destruction of property, killing; and whoever does that, that's violence, and I think it's wrong.

Student in audience: I'd like to ask Bishop Kennedy, how do you answer when some of the students,--they are asking, Is God dead? How do you answer that?

Bishop Kennedy: I tell 'em No. [Laughter.]

Same Student: You tell 'em No?

Bishop Kennedy: Uh-huh. He's alive.

Same student: Well, after the atrocities that have been going on in the world, and one of them the Vietnam War right now, for instance, and the young people being exposed; and you've already expressed that you're against it,--I'd like to ask you, have you done anything about it, openly demonstrated against it with the young people?

Bishop Kennedy: Uh-huh, I have. What's that got to do--You're not counting that up as to whether God is dead or not?

Same student: Yes. How do you prove to them that God is alive, if they believe that even God existed once?

Bishop Kennedy: Well, you don't prove it, and God in the world doesn't mean that everything that happens is according to his will. He's given men freedom, and we do a lot of fool things; but the presence of God and the Spirit of God continues to lead men in another direction [Applause], and I don't think it's changed any.

Teacher in audience: Bishop Kennedy, several things very quickly. A man once said, "There is no society of angels, black, white, or brown." And I have a feeling sometimes that we get disillusioned very easily because we don't find a perfect society, and I would like to ask your opinion or your response to one thing I am a father I have two children, one seven and one three. And you know, I love those kids, and when I see my students come in the class--I have taught junior high, senior high, and junior college--I know you students might find this hard to believe, but believe it or not, no matter how crusty we get, we care. I know that there's a lot of talk about don't trust people over thirty. What I'd like is your response on this talk about the generation gap, because in spite of what has been said, and in spite of everything that's happened, in the last ten years, we old folks--even though we have gray in our hair--we do care. We want the best for you young people.

Bishop Kennedy: Yes. Well, I think this generation gap's very unfortunate for those under thirty and certainly unfortunate for those over thirty. It's a very sad situation when a society gets separated according to age. We need each other very badly, and those under thirty certainly need something of the wisdom and perspective of those older; and heaven knows that those of us who are older need this coming generation to keep us alive, alert, and realize what's going on, because we do take things more easy, and we settle down. But you prevent that, so the healthy society is not a separated society; it's a society where young and old find a meeting ground in the society's future and a general belief that out there ahead is a better world which we can create, but neither group can do it by themselves.

THIRD SESSION

A. "Dilemmas of the NOW Generation," by Dr. Mervin Freedman, Professor of Psychology, San Francisco State College, and Dean of the Graduate Division of Wright Institute, Berkeley, California.

The title I have been given, "Dilemmas of the NOW Generation: Rejection of Customary Values," makes certain assumptions: that there is such a thing as a "now" generation, that it experiences dilemmas, and that rejection of customary values is taking place.

Consider that phrase, rejection of customary values. Accusations of perfidy directed at youth are ancient, and I do mean ancient. They've unearthed Babylonian tablets which essentially say, "Woe unto youth. They are really headed for trouble because of the bad things that they are doing." And those of you familiar with Roman history remember your Tacitus standing in doorways watching various factions of Romans fighting in the streets and longing for the virtues of the Roman republic. Those of you who live in the Bay Area who may watch our local educational television station, KQED, possibly have been viewing the Forsyte Saga. In one of the last episodes John Forsyte, who was too young to have fought in the First World War but who comes to maturity shortly after that, says that he does not want to enter business or a profession in the tradition of the family but rather that he would like to become a farmer. And he would like to become a farmer because he feels that he could really contribute something to society in this way; and moreover it is non-competitive.

I remember at the height of the Haight-Ashbury, a few years back, a good friend of mine who lives in London was visiting. My wife and I were showing him around, showing him the local color and reporting some of the activities of the Haight-Ashbury crowd. He reported that there was nothing new in it for him. He had been at school in Cambridge, that is Cambridge, England, in the 1920's, and had seen all the things going on in the Haight-Ashbury area--for example, a public "gay" society, sexual freedom, bi-sexuality, all of this. These were very common at Cambridge in the 20's except that they were really not publicized. You could read about them in novels of Evelyn Waugh, but most people did not know about them. But there essentially was nothing new. Dr. Clark Kerr is fond of reading an editorial from the Los Angeles Times denouncing the radicals and socialists at Berkeley, an editorial that was written back in 1904.

So there is a good question as to whether there is really something new going on, or whether much of what we now regard as rejection of customary values is the kind of thing that is a product of the instant labeling that goes on these days.

You know, everything has to have a label. We have "now" clothes and "now" cigarettes. For television purposes we have to digest very complicated occurences in one or two minutes; that is, the People's Park controversy at Berkeley or an anti-Vietnam protest or a student strike has to be summed up in sixty seconds for a vast television audience. Under these circumstances it's really very easy to build a case for a view that accords with one's own perspective.

I was really struck by this a little while ago when various officials or dignitaries from the world of sports chose the all-time baseball and football teams. In the case of baseball, on the all-time baseball teams, the most recent player was Joe Dimaggio; that is, practically everybody on the team had played in the early years of this century; Ty Cobb and Walter Johnson and so forth; but no Bob Gibson and no Sandy Kaufax, no Henry Aaron and no Willie Mays. When it came to the all-time football team, it was quite another matter. Practically everybody on the team is playing now or has played very recently. There were just a few relatively old-timers and not so old at that; that is, Red Grange and Bronco Nagurski; but the quarterback was John Unitas, and one of the running backs was Jim Brown.

Well, there is something very peculiar about this. It is very hard to think that somehow or other all the great football players are playing now or played just very recently, whereas in the case of baseball there is something very different about that sport so that all of the great players are people who played prior, in the main, to 1930. It is hard to escape the view that there is something of the traditionalist in the officials in the baseball world and essentially they have chosen people who accord temperamentally with their views. But nevertheless, despite all these caveats, I do think that there is something to this view of the rejection of the customary values. I think it has more cogency now than it has had in the past.

I think that there is something in the view that there is a "now generation," something deep and fundamental. And what I mean is this; I think the old myths by which we have been living are collapsing around us. Consider Thanksgiving. I noted last November that the old image or images of Thanksgiving were no more; that is, going by sleigh to grandmother's house. When I was a boy practically every newspaper signified Thanksgiving with pictures or sketches of the visit to the farm. I don't recall one newspaper--the New York Times, which I read occasionally, or the San Francisco Chronicle or the Berkeley Gazette--which even once carried this image. A good example of the kind of thing I mean is the demise of the comic strip "Gasoline Alley." You remember that. It represented a kind of world: the small-town life, the small business, a garage, the grandfather's farm. "Gasoline Alley" was dropped from the San Francisco Chronicle several years ago, and we now have a number of different kinds of comic strips that replace it. Steve Roper, for example, who's a hell-for-leather newspaper man, really a kind of a private eye, or Tiffany Jones, who is a model who operates in London and Malta and the South of France and other swinging places.

Or consider Fourth of July oratory. This is becoming a thing of the past. To the best of my knowledge, not even Spiro Agnew made a speech last Independence Day extolling the virtues of the American way. Needless to say, the centuries-old Christian myth--that is, the idea of a Supernal Being who somehow orders the universe and the promise of a life hereafter--does not provide the comfort it once did to many people in and out of the church. A life of thrift, hard work, accumulation of possessions, does not have the conviction or the appeal that it once possessed. Very simply, I would say industrial society, that is, western industrial society, is in the evening, in the twilight.

A caveat again is in order here. What I have been describing is an urban phenomenon to some extent, a coastal phenomenon, and to some extent a middle-class phenomenon. If one looks at football games, particularly those emanating from the South and the Southwest, things are somewhat different. There is Billy Graham before the game, leading the audience in a prayer for peace. There is a color guard for Old Glory. There is a festival queen, usually a blonde, and her court. When "Ole Miss" makes a first down, Confederate flags are waved, and the Apache Belles from Tyler Junior College in Tyler, Texas, perform at half-time, while the band plays "Aint She Sweet?" The players who knock heads are clean-cut young men, although these days they do have sideburns. When one looks at this, one recognizes that the old virtues and values are not dead among some people in some parts of the country. In Cicero, Illinois, or Hamtramck, Michigan, the sons of blue-collar workers are still interested in jobs, booze, and girls.

Nevertheless, I do believe that urban youths, for example, those of the San Francisco area, represent a wave of the future. In a relatively short time, a decade or so, a large segment or majority of American youth will be like them. I do believe that we are now at a watershed in history, a period comparable to the beginnings of the Christian era or the Renaissance or the Industrial Revolution. I believe that the character of western man is changing. I consider these to be the results of powerful revolutionary pressures. Young people are getting ready for a different kind of future. The forces that motivate them are inchoate; they are not conscious, but nevertheless they are very powerful. I liken this to something like the kinds of changes that have taken place when one considers the biological evolution; that is, as the climate became colder, animals began to grow heavier coats, and those animals for whom genetic mutation produced heavier coats were the ones that survived. I think in a similar way young people in our society are getting ready for a different kind of social and personal future.

So in short I do think that there is a lot to the notion of a "now" generation, and we may ask ourselves what characterizes it. First of all, I think the ability to live with unpredictability. The world is becoming more unpredictable all the time. It may have a physical base to some extent, or at least a physical analogy is apt. If you let gas out of a bottle, the movement of the molecules that were enclosed in the bottle becomes more and more random all the time. The longer the gas is out of the bottle the more random become the movements of these molecules. As we have an older universe or an older earth, it may well be that the motion of the atoms comprising all of the matter that makes it up becomes more predictable. Needless to say this is somewhat speculative. More down to earth, I think that a lot of the unpredictability has to do simply with advances, if you want to call them that, in technology.

Now I don't mean to mount an assault on science; really on the spirit of science, that is, the search for truth, which I think is the real spirit of science. But there are times when I can't help wondering whether we might not be better off if they had burned Galileo after all. When one looks at the space program and thinks of all the money that is spent on it, and one then encounters a student who can't stay in school because he does'nt have $200, one wonders.

I was just reading the other day about certain military advances, if we may call them that; that is, certain means of detecting any kind of movement out there in the darkness or in the impenetrable jungle or detecting any unusual source of heat in the atmosphere. Whether this movement or this heat may result from a child, or a dog, or perhaps from an enemy soldier is unknown. But if it's detected, it will draw fire. One cannot help being dismayed under these circumstances. Think of some of the other unpredictable effects of transistors or technology. Not very long ago, we could have hardly anticipated some of the effects. For example, much of the power of Abdul Nasser in Egypt rests upon the radio. He is able to appeal to a great many fellahin in Egypt and peasants in other Arab lands who are illiterate, who otherwise probably would hardly even know his name. The people who were developing transistors a decade or two ago could hardly have forseen such results.

Or consider some artichoke grower in California who sprinkled DDT on his field to increase his yield of artichokes. He can hardly anticipate that this might mean that some Eskimo fishing off the waters of Alaska will catch fish that have ingested some of this DDT. Or simply consider over-population and the unpredictability introduced by this. We call it over-population; more strictly, let us say simply larger numbers of people. Let's say that one percent of the population, or some such figure, is likely to do something damaging; that is, is likely to put a knife on you and ask for your money or run into your car while in a drunken stupor. If you meet 500 people a day, the chances are, you see, that you are exposed to five such people. But if you meet 1500 people in a day, as one does as population increases, one is exposed to fifteen people. In short, the world is becoming more unpredictable all the time, and I think that young people in particular recognize this and are preparing for it.

Another characteristic of the "now" generation is simply less attachment to what I would call certain social myths. I would liken it in our time to the effects of psychoanalysis several decades back on the images of ourselves and on the images of society. Consider the import of psychoanalysis for the concepts that people hold of themselves. Back in 1900 a Victorian gentleman with his stiff collar and his clean linen and his rolled umbrella regarded himself as the epitome of rationality, maturity, stability, and what have you. Psychoanalysis introduced into his self-concept the realization that he was not only an adult, but also that the child was very strong within him; that all kinds of incoherent fantasies, what sometimes we called unconscious fantasies, motivated him; and so on. I think we are experiencing the same thing now with regard to our social mythology. Consider phrases like "Land of the Free" and "Home of the Brave." We now recognize that underneath these fine phrases lie such activities as slavery, slaughter of the Indians, relocation of the Japanese, and the like. The effects are really profound. The social myths by which most Americans have been living really are dying.

Not that this phenomenon has reached scholars too well. I had to listen a while back to a historian who was expounding on the Age of Jackson. He was describing this as the age of the common man, the time when the common man came to the fore in American life. Not a word about the Indians and what was happening to them at the time or not a word about this period of

American life, the 1830's, when slavery, which was a hit-and-miss proposition before that, really not too viable economically, was really being established on a firm footing This is really an incredible thing, and I think that increasingly our young people will be aware of the mythological underpinnings of such beliefs.

Allied to these phenomena is lessening deference to authority. If it is functional to render less homage to the past, one similarly renders less obeisance to its representatives: conventional authorities of all kinds--parents, politicians, representatives of the church, the state, and the school. This phenomenon, the decline of authority, goes a long way back. It goes back probably to some extent to World War II, to World War I, to the early 1900's in American Life, and perhaps in the Western World as far back as the Renaissance.

But I think that these phenomena are really being exacerbated now. And to give you an example of what I mean, consider how relatively common it is for young people these days, that is middle-class young people, to go to jail for reasons of civil disobedience, for reasons of drug offenses, and the like. These kinds of things are accepted with relative equanimity Thirty years ago, twenty or even ten years ago, the acquaintances and families of middle-class youths who went to jail would have been shocked beyond measure Now somehow conventional society, is hardly afforded the obedience and the deference that were its due a very short time ago.

Another quality of what we call the "now generation" is the beginnings of new images of community I think it's clear that our traditional communities are dying; that is, if we think of a community as a place where people have ties, ties that mean something to one another, communities are really breaking down. This is happening in colleges, cities, and towns Statistics show that student rebellion is most likely to take place in an institution of large size. It seems pretty clear that the larger the institution the less likelihood that people within it will have ties with one another that will mean something. The traditional family is surely losing its grip It is hard to know where we are going in this respect, but I think it is clear that we need communities that transcend the self and the individual family, communities that really provide a setting in which people can matter to one another I don't know that young people have given us very good leads in this respect. I think that this is one of those areas where they do well at telling us that something is wrong, but don't do a very good job of providing a solution.

We might ask at this point, Why is it that some of these things are happening now? Some of the characteristics that I have been ascribing to this "now generation" have been around for a long time. It is not that they have popped up de novo on the American scene There are many answers to a question like this. Undoubtedly one of them is affluence. If we have a large segment of our population that does not need to commit itself very early in life, they have more time to look around themselves, to think, to reflect, to decide what they like and don't like. In this respect I think we can hardly underestimate the importance of college attendance The United States is now approaching a point at which fifty percent of the population will be in some kind of college or other, or at least will enter some kind of college, after high school What this means, you see, is that fifty percent of the youth in this country will have considerable time to decide just what it is that they want to be and just what it is that they want to do with their lives. As I said a moment ago, I think we can hardly overestimate the importance of this phenomenon I would ascribe many of the changes that are taking place in our society, particularly among young people to this very simple demographic phenomenon, the very large numbers of young people who go on to a college of some kind, meaning that somehow they have bought more time to make decisions about themselves and their society

Another element in this issue or question of how it is that suddenly things are changing so rapidly is the effect of the mass media. The mass media produce a new generation every few years. It is not uncommon, you know, for relatively young people, let's say people of the age of twenty-five, to say that they feel a whole generation removed from high school youth.

Not too long ago, it was five years ago this coming spring, I made a study of high school youth in San Mateo. At the time I was interested in drinking practices; that is I was interested in such issues as how much they drank, on what occasions, what age they started to drink, and the like. Peripherally my colleagues and I asked some questions about use of drugs. Drugs were becoming a fairly consequential phenomenon on college campuses at the time, but in high school not much attention was paid them. It developed that practically none of the students we interviewed had had any experience with drugs, and, moreover, practically none of them knew any students who were having such experiences. I had occasion only two years later to repeat this study, at which time drugs were widespread. In the very short time of two years the phenomenon of drug usage had gone from an incidence of almost zero to one of thirty or forty percent.

Reflect on what this means for the institutions in our society. They are geared, you see, for evolutionary change If you think of colleges and universities, they are really prepared for changes that take place over decades You know the way it used to work; something would be introduced at Harvard; some of the other prestigious colleges and universities would emulate it, because obviously if Harvard did it, it was a good thing. That took ten or twenty years, and finally some of the institutions of lesser prestige would decide that such and such ought to be done because the more prestigious institutions in that region were doing it. So if something were introduced at Harvard, two or three decades later it would have permeated the institutions of higher education throughout our society. We hardly have the luxury of dealing with change in this fashion now. Similarly, it may well be that Jeffersonian democracy as exemplified in our checks-and-balance system of government, is really not functional to deal with the pace of change in our society Surely the mass media throughout the world, and the United States in particular, produce profound effects with which we are hardly prepared to cope.

Let me say this now, that my sympathy most generally is with what we call the "now generation," although I guess you would have to call me a square or a straight I have four children, three cats and a dog, two cars, and a home in the Berkeley hills I even go to all the home football games at Berkeley. I liken my feelings to those of a woman I read about--this would have been in the early 50's in The New Statesman, at the time called The New

Statesman and Nation. This was a very interesting little piece. This woman, in her fifties perhaps sixties, had inherited a house, a house with a great many posessions--fine china and silver, linens, and so forth. She was going over the house, looking through the correspondence of the individuals who had lived in it. Much of the correspondence went back to Victorian times, to the 19th century, to the days prior to the telephone, prior to jet planes and quick transportation, when people wrote letters. She was reading the numerous letters that she had inherited in which people described in great detail their reflections on themselves, on their houses, on their properties. Her reaction at first was to be greatly charmed by this way of life, so different from England, post World War II. Then suddenly a great rage seized her, because she thought of her brother who had died in the First World War. He had been dead about thirty-five years, and it occurred to her suddenly that this charming way of life had ended up in the carnage of the First World War.

I can't help feeling that same way about what we might call middle-class America now, or what is sometimes referred to as the silent majority, fouling the earth and the air and raining bombs on Vietnam and Laos in support of puppet regimes. I am on the side of the "now generation" in their condemnation of the status quo.

Well, I have ranged myself on the side of what we might call this "now generation," but I do have some reservations that I would like to present. One of them is a very crucial issue for education, child rearing, personality theory, psychology, and sociology. It has to do with the general issue of impulse and control in the personality. Quite clearly, those young people who somehow are part of what is called the "now generation" are much freer in expression of impulse. But a very crucial question is the matter of when this freedom can or should be introduced into the personality. For example, I think that it's rather hard to get excited about some twenty-one year-old student blowing grass on Saturday night. But what if it is a fourteen year-old who is smoking pot? What does this mean for his future development? Similarly, I find it again difficult to get very excited if two students, let us say age twenty-one, two students who care about each other, want to have sex relations. But what if these are fifteen or sixteen year-olds? What does this mean for their future development?

In a primitive society, where social roles are very simple--let's say where all the men are hunters, or farmers, or fishermen and where the things that they need to learn in order to get along in that society are simple--young people can be and normally are allowed a great deal of freedom. But in a very complex society, where all kinds of demands on people are necessary because of the very complexity of the society, the issues are really very different. Is it possible to exercise a great deal of freedom of impulse quite early in life and become a complex person, shall we say, later in life? This is something that has bothered me a great deal in the utterances of certain middle-aged gurus in our society. What may be a most educational experience for someone who is thirty-five may hardly be the same thing for somebody who is seventeen.

Lastly, let me close on this note. Freedom of impulse by and large appeals to me, but I think we have to recognize that life and society require more.

Some of you may have seen the latest issue of Look magazine. The issue is devoted to the "Outlook for the 70's." The magazine is filled with a great many naked bodies against the sun, the wind, the rain, and the sea. Quite clearly, what is conveyed in this issue of Look is the sense that what we really need in our society is a lot more freedom of expression. I think that is right, but we need more besides, and I should like to close by quoting from an article on William Blake written by John Sutherland, a professor of English at Colby College. William Blake lived in times not very different from ours. He lived through the French Revolution and through the American Revolution. The British Crown was "uptight," one might say, in much the same way that the government of the United States is "uptight" now. The British establishment felt threatened. Authority was threatened. And William Blake started out in his own life feeling that the answer to human living lay in freedom of impulse. Blake's early optimistic answer to the human predicament was that liberation would come through expanded consciousness, including sexual emancipation. But when Blake came to write Jerusalem, he turned his emphasis from sexual liberation and consciousness expansion to what he came to feel was the overwhelming need for mutual love and the continous mutual forgiveness of sins. Blake envisioned no alternative but to struggle on with art and argument, struggle through mental fights to enlarge men's sympathies and perceptions until they dared to love their own humanity and that of their fellows.

Life is very hard for us all now, I think; that is, for those of us who care. We see many things in our society that trouble us. We should like to change them, and sometimes there seems to be no alternative except to resort to violence in order to change them. Blake struggled with this dilemma and finally decided that violence in the long run was destructive to all parties concerned, the protagonist and the recipient. I'd like to repeat these lines: "struggle through mental flight to enlarge men's sympathies and perceptions until they dare to love their own humanity and that of their fellows."

We have talked about a "now generation," or rather I have, as if it were somehow completely autonomous from the rest of society, from the adults or older people in the society in which they live. Well, that is not true. Young people are influenced, or they can be influenced, by teachers, by educators if we can be real teachers and educators; and I think at this time the greatest message we have to convey is this one: "enlarge men's sympathies and perceptions until they dare to love their own humanity and that of their fellows." Thank you.

B. "Aspirations of Minority Cultures," by Dr. Norval L. Smith, President of Meritt Junior College, in Oakland, California

I would like, as briefly as possible, to touch upon some dimensions of the topic that I have been assigned and to change it a little bit. Instead of trying to talk about the aspirations of minority cultures, I would like to say something about the concerns and reactions of black and brown students in the 60's as I have seen them develop, both indirectly through my years in community development, and directly the last two years at Merritt College.

I suppose I should start by telling you something about Merritt, since I think it is the type of school where minority aspirations have certainly had very vocal expression, and I suppose that is why I was asked to be here. People keep asking me to be part of programs, sometimes I think, because I may not be around next year, and they want to tap my experience while it's relevant. In any event, Merritt probably does represent the prototype of the open-door community college that we talk about. We have a rather diverse enrollment, representative, however, of the area we serve. Ethnically we are about thirty-five percent black, about ten percent Asian, mostly Chinese recently in the country, two percent Chicano, and then about half of our student body, the majority group, a very large percent of them spill-overs from the spirit of Berkeley, representing young people of the type Dr. Freedman was talking about. It does give us a rather interesting mix when you consider additionally that almost two-thirds of our students are over twenty-one and about sixty percent of them low income. We are located in the midst of one of the large black concentrations of Oakland, which also happens to have a fairly high crime rate and all the manifestations of inner-city living, something like City College of New York might have represented thirty years ago, Dr. Freedman.

Now in addition to that very brief profile, we have an image at Merritt which we have to live with and hopefully capitalize upon, and every once in a while that image is projected by the press in a manner which the students and I think is intended to embarrass the college. But sometimes they goof, and in saying things they think are embarassing, they end up complimenting us backhandedly. For example, the February, 1969 issue of Newsweek had a major feature series on "The Black Mood on Campus." It talked about Merritt as being the training ground for revolutionaries. Just because Huey Newton and Bobby Seale happen to be former students at Merritt, the conclusion was that this certainly has to be a kind of a blackboard jungle operation where all the teachers walk around with their rifles in order to survive. This has been followed up by a number of other recent articles, I guess the most recent of which was the Wall Street Journal expose of Merritt on November 18, 1969, which had an article entitled "The Campus Where Black Power Won." They go on to point out that the unique aspect of this power is that it was won with the encouragement and aid of the school's President. That sounds sort of like a communist plot, but I think they were simply saying that we were, as the students say, taking care of business and making our institution relevant to our total constituency. I just wish that they could have done it in a less sensational manner. But in any event, Merritt and the other Merritts in our statewide system (and there are probably fifteen or so of them now) certainly do represent the most intense expression of minority student and minority community aspirations.

I would like to finally make reference in this overview to three or four recent publications that I think would be of interest to you. The March, 1969 issue of College Management Magazine had what I thought was an excellent series called "Can the Universities Survive the Black Challenge?" The June 21 article I thought was quite good. And then the later one of December 20, 1969, "The Challenge of Open Admissions," dealt with a lot of the manifestations of the problems that I see emerging from this whole movement that I like to call the democratization of higher education.

It isn't really something that started at the college and university level, in my judgment It really developed during the 40's and 50's when, as a result of whatever social forces grew out of World War II, and I guess out of the changes in the 30's, we began to envision the secondary schools as serving all of the people's children, and we began to see all of the people's children aspiring to stay in school and to graduate and to get what was then a rather significant union card, the high school diploma. I think that movement has simply mushroomed, and now in the late 60's we see it being reflected in the aspirations of the minority and low-income and disadvantaged young people to get into the system by taking advantage of public higher education. And obviously those of us in the community college movement know that we are at the real threshold of that movement, and that if it is going to make it in a state like California, it has to make it through the community colleges, which as of last year's statistics had something like eighty percent of all the undergraduate enrollments in public higher education in the state and about ninety-five percent of all the minority and low-income students in the state. So certainly we are the critical segment of the tri-partite system of higher education. Despite this, however, I think we should recognize that enrollments in higher education have not grown fast enough as far as black and brown students are concerned In 1968, nationally, the freshmen classes were made up of six percent black students despite the fact that blacks represented twelve percent of the college-age population. One other statistic, thirty percent of the college population in the country in that year was attending public colleges and universities, but only two percent of the black college population was enrolled in those public institutions of higher learning. And I don't think California was a hell of a way off of that mark. We were supposed to be an enlightened, progressive state, until recently.

I think there are some societal changes that we ought to be aware of or reflect upon, as we think about this subject, which have greatly affected minority student attitudes, if that's what we are talking about, attitudes as a reflection of their aspirations or lack of aspirations or motivation. Certainly as has been mentioned by other speakers, the whole business of the disenchantment with our system, and even more specifically, as far as black and brown students are concerned, the disenchantment with integration and its relative progress and promise, have been factors that have weighed heavily upon the black and brown student mood The rejection of white society and its values for whatever reason has been another factor However, at the same time we have seen an increase, not fast enough but rather dramatic and revolutionary in itself, in the number of black and brown students on predominantly white campuses in the north and the west, which has led to a much higher degree of solidarity among black and brown students, a building of brotherhood and identity which I suppose many of the earlier minorities--the Italians, the Jews, during the 30's and 40's--never really developed in the same sense because they were'nt as visible, and of course they could very easily opt for integration. But the badge of black and brown color has made this not a practical aspiration for most minority group youngsters And, of course, much of this has been reflected in recent years in the mushrooming of black and brown consciousness or race pride or interest in La Raza, which in my way of thinking is one of the more meaningful, positive things that has happened as we've seen the opening up of access to higher education for minority young people Of course access is not the only concern. At our school we haven't had to worry about recruiting black or brown or low-income students for a long time. Our big problem is in holding power, and it will become your problem if you stay at the task of trying to deal with the total constituency.

What then are some of the major concerns of minority students? I think many of their concerns coincide with those of white students. To start with, at least, they are concerned about the lack of respect for them as human beings and as individuals who have something to say, this lack of respect coming from faculty and administrators who don't really have any serious concern for the opinions and feelings of these young adults. That is what we are dealing with for the most part in our type of institution. I think there is concern about what is always being talked about these days: the lack of meaningful involvement in decision making, being able to make some of the hard decisions, going beyond the perfunctory level of advisory committees to really being a functional part of the so-called governance of the college.

Of course this has caused a strong reaction from other elements of the college community. At Merritt, for example, I think some of our serious unresolved issues are those of the relationship between the power of the faculty, which after many years of winning faculty power, isn't very willing to share it overnight with students. The whole business of trying to bring in the non-teaching personnel has caused some anxiety on our campus. Giving the clerks and the custodians a chance to have something to say about the governance structure has been a little bit of a traumatic experience for faculty and even to some extent for students who are strongly concerned about their own involvement but aren't too sure these "lowly" staff members have as big a stake in the institution as they have.

The lack of so-called relevance, I guess, has gotten most of the attention, and by this I think young people mean the inability of the faculty to relate instruction to contemporary conditions in society and at the same time to relate it to the environments out of which the students come.

Now, going along with these major concerns, which are not necessarily unique to black and brown students, are some others that are more pinpointed: concern about the lack of understanding and sensitivity on the part of the predominantly white faculty and administrators in these institutions. I don't know if we are going to have to eventually mandate in-service training--and I have serious doubts that we're going to--but the rubbing of shoulders of governance structures brings into proper focus the black and brown experience, which is so far removed from the awareness and consciousness of most of the members of the faculties and staffs of our colleges and universities.

I think the students are concerned about what they label as racism, and of course this is a very easy thing to use as description of any behavior that you don't go along with, but I think that there are manifestations of it on most campuses that are hard to deny. The business of, at least indirectly, equating minority status and the disadvantaged. The whole concept of E.O.P. [Extended Opportunity Programs and Services Act], which sort of concludes that the only way you are really going to have black and brown students on campus is to make exceptions and to almost go out on the street and get *the* most disadvantaged students to bring them on to campus to prove that *you* are being democratic, while at the same time not giving a damn about changing the basic admissions procedures that would bring in good average black and brown high school graduates who aren't super-niggers and super-Chicanos--this to me is the reflection of the racism that students are talking about. I think the whole business of expecting these new constituents who are coming on to the campus to do all of the adapting without having the institution do any of the adapting and accommodating is a form of racism. I think that, although the students are rather vocal in what appears to be a put-down of whites, they are really trying to say that they feel that there has to be some elevation of blacks and brown or some leveling of this relationship, this paternalistic relationship between those that do the serving and those who are what I call the customers of the service.

And of course this leads to the concern which has been reflected in what we call separatism. My personal feeling is that separatism is more of a strategy than a long range goal, and I feel, based on my own experiences of a black person going to college after World War II and going to a fundamentally white institution, that separatism will pass out of existence, but only after there has been major progress in the achievement of the goals of these new young people that are coming into these strange and hostile institutions.

I think that minority students are expressing great concern about the lack of ethnically balanced staffs, and I don't know what's really going to solve this problem other than, of course, allowing a little time for us to build a larger pool of so-called qualified black and brown people to take the positions we are now holding open for them in order to guarantee this balance. I think that it is going to take, more than anything else, some guts on behalf of the administrators to challenge what in many ways is the tyranny of the faculties in wanting to remain inbred. I don't think we can rely entirely upon the judgment and the warm-hearted feelings of department heads to go out and aggressively seek black and brown faculty members. I think administrators are going to have to refuse to sign some of these personnel actions for departments that have no black or brown teachers in schools that have thirty or forty percent minority student bodies.

Then, of course, I think the students, perhaps not so much in a school like Merritt but in the university and state colleges, are rather "uptight" about the tremendous lack of proportional minority group enrollments. New York City is going to be facing up to this as they attempt to implement their new open enrollment program. We have implemented it on paper here, but we are still far from having anything like the relationship between the number of black and brown students on the campuses of the University and the State Colleges, and many of our community colleges, and the proportional minority enrollments in high school. I am especially concerned about those who graduate from high school and should be aspiring to higher education and should be encouraged to take advantage of the excellent programs that many of our colleges and universities have in their own home communities.

Let me just say that I think one of the other things that's going to have to be done is to take a hard look at the number of out-of-state students and foreign students that flock to our publicly supported institutions. I am not sure we can continue to have three or four hundred foreign students on a campus like Merritt while at the same time reaching a situation soon where we will have to be denying first-choice admission to students that live within our own Peralta District. I am not sure the University of California can continue denying access to average black students while letting large percentages of their lower-division enrollments come from New Jersey or New York or having major segments of their graduate programs come from Venezuela or Chile or Iran. I think if the promise of public higher education is going to be real, we are going to have to make some value judgments about the priorities of bringing our own indigenous population into the system. Maybe we will have to ask the Federal government and the State Department to underwrite whatever the benefits of this international program [are] that we have in institutions like Berkeley, that have become almost a national resource, rather than a state institution serving the needs of the people who pay the taxes.

Now, perhaps the most significant concern in the last year or two as expressed by minority students has been that related to ethnic studies of one sort or another, what is very generally described as the presenting of the black and brown experience in this country, sometimes related to the related African and Central American experience. I think in many ways the demands that are being made and have been made for ethnic studies are really a reaction to inaction regarding the lack of both curricular and faculty integration. I think black students and brown students are saying that if there had been some gradual integration of the subject matter over the years, there would be less concern for such a dramatic thing as the creation of separate departments of black studies and Chicano studies, which we have, for example, at Merritt. In many ways I think students are saying this is the only way they are going to get black and brown faculty, by insisting that people from those ethnic backgrounds do the teaching in those programs. So, I think, as is so often the case when you fail to act, you have to spend a greatly disproportional amount of time reacting, and I think that is in many ways what has happened in the whole area of ethnic studies.

I think that from my own experience I could say that there is a rather significant reinforcement of the cultural image of minority students and there is a motivational relationship growing out of these programs. Even the limited experience we've had verifies this, although at Merritt we've had perhaps four years' experience on a limited basis and two or two-and-a-half years of intensive experience with a large offering that transcends many of the traditional fields of humanities, social sciences, and behavorial sciences. I think we really have a golden opportunity to test some of our theories of interdisciplinary education without being hung up on traditional subject matter lines. We feel at Merritt, that black studies and brown studies, if they're going to be relevant, ought to be made a part of general education, exposed to the total student body, including the majority group of young people. As a matter of fact, some theorists like Arthur Lewis say that black students shouldn't waste their time studying about the experiences they've grown up in; we ought to limit those courses to enrollment by white students. But at the same time we have other persons who would claim they ought to be limited to enrollment by black and brown students because the essence of the program is to learn the ways to fight racism by using these courses in a somewhat propagandistic manner. I think somewhere between those two extremes lies the real benefit and long-range contribution of ethnic studies.

Now I think, because of time and the fact that we do want to have some time for give and take, I'd like to just conclude by summarizing some of the literature and my own reactions to this general topic. I think that most black and brown students, as far as their aspirations are concerned, still adhere to traditional motives concerning getting into the system. It may not be the case in a few more years, but as of 1970 I think they still fundamentally share the American dream. I think that the efforts we have seen in recent years for the disadvantaged and minority students, and which in many instances has been seen as kind of a "cop-out," ought to be looked at in the light of the tremendous subsidies for middle-class white students which we have made in higher education for decades. Of course we call them graduate "fellowships" and we label it "research." But I think Walter Lippman said it rather meaningfully a few years ago when he said that the affluent and comfortable people--at that time about eighty percent and now about eighty-five percent of the American people--are simply going to have to make the sacrifice to bring the other twenty percent into the system. I think that the contributions of the minority students in the movements of the last couple of years should be recognized as a very valuable challenge to the system and should be taken seriously. Somebody has got to look at society every generation or so, and it's about time we had a good look. I think the black and brown students, being independent of the system and lacking vested interest in it, relatively speaking, are able to look at the system more objectivly in terms of how it is meeting their needs. I think they bring special insights in terms of their particular environments in the ghetto and bario that can only be found from those experiences, and it's going to be a part of what America will be. We ought to look at it as something that we have to redirect in some positive expression.

I would conclude, despite efforts in the other direction, that white racism is still a phenomenon that exists on many campuses and still promotes alienation and frustration and failure on behalf of minority group students. I think that higher education carried on behind barbed wires, we'll soon discover if we haven't already, is no education at all.

Finally, I would like to conclude by reading the statement that Buell Gallagher made when he resigned from City College of New York, last year, which I think sort of epitomizes all of what we are talking about here. He said, "I could have wished that the pace of institutional change had kept ahead of rising expectations born of the successes of the civil rights movement, but institutional inertia did not yield fast enough, and the pressure of long-deferred hopes left no room for careful and considered action." I think our students at Merritt would say, "Right-on." Thank-you.

Questions and Answers following the Speeches of Dr. Freedman and Dr. Smith.

Student in audience, addressing Dr. Smith: You stated about black and brown students still adhering to traditional motives concerning getting into the system. At this time, because I am a student and I am black, I would like you to mention some of the traditional motives, black and brown use and are in favor of still, because I don't think I see them as being traditional, necessarily.

Dr. Smith: You are asking me what are the traditional motivations that still infect the minds of minority students? Well I think they all want to be independent, have a job and make money--that's rather traditional. I think they want status among their fellows, family, and peers--I think that's rather traditional. I think the best example I could give is the fact that some of our hardest-core millitants--and that is not meant to be a derogatory statement, because some of those are the real heroes of the black revolution in my judgment, young men who have put a couple of years on campus at the sacrifice of their studies, giving leadership to the movement and working in the community--do, as most of us, get to that point at age twenty-three or twenty-four when they want to get married and want to move into the system and take part in directing it and becoming independent, productive members of that system. And I think it is a trick bag for us to conclude, as some of our white radical friends can afford to, that the only strategy is one of complete overthrow of the system, because in many communities like Oakland, black people will be taking over the system. And you know, if you're going to run a revolution you have to know how to make fire, find water, and do all those functional things, and you can't go back to Pasadena or to Palo Alto very easily. If you're black, you will probably spend most of your life in the black community, and I think there are very good examples of the fact that black students do and should share in most of the traditional aspirations of young people, of getting into the system. That is what I was trying to say.

Speaker in audience, to Dr. Smith: The Community college has enjoyed, I think historically, a close, usually relevant relationship with its community, and I think we'll agree to the belief that higher education, particularly as it relates to community college, can serve as a conscience to the community. Would you react to this please. Let's put it this way: there is a certain autonomy that is lacking for the president of the community college, a lack of freedom to operate in the development of a faculty environment or the selection of staff members who can move with him in the development of a more relevant and a more viable academic community at the community college. Could you react to or share with us your own frustrations or solutions to this kind of reduced or minimized autonomy?

Dr. Smith: You say that there isn't much self-determination for administrators. That's true, but we still wield an awful lot of power, and I find that ninety-nine-and-a-half percent of the things, for example, that students, black, Chicano, radical and otherwise come to me and express concern about can be done within the existing structure. I wouldn't want to under-emphasize the potential that the administration has to do things within the system without falling back on either legal restrictions or the lack of faculty direction or lack of funds or whatever. In our own situation at Merritt I think that the circumstances that prevailed prior to my coming had sort of sensitized the faculty to the fact that there were going to have to be some dramatic changes, at least in the paternalistic relationship between faculty and students. I wasn't surprised to find that most of the student hang-ups and concerns appeared to be with faculty rather than with administrators. I think this past year we have made some real progress in that the rather conservative faculty leadership of the last two years has been replaced through student pressure and intimidation and harrassement, including Chicano students who locked up the faculty senate for three hours one day, and they probably would still be there if I hadn't convinced them in that particular instance that the Board was the only group that could make the decision that would relate to their concerns. But I think that there is an evolutionary movement in faculties. It is either evolutionary change within the system or to seek another job. We've had the blessing, I guess, of expansion in our District which permits some of our faculty who are not prepared to make an adjustment to a changing institution to move along to another institution where they might blossom and become more able to relate. But I'm not distressed at all. I spend most of my time trying to negotiate those differences between faculty and students, and perhaps that is the basic role of the administrator in addition to what Bishop Kennedy said, being a facilitator of those matters that make it possible for the faculty to get on with the business of teaching and relating to students.

I think one of the other things I'd say about the faculty is that I would like to think that eventually we would move back in the direction of having faculty also do some counseling so that they can establish a little more meaningful relationship with students than what they are able to have in the traditional 500 weekly student-contact-hour experience. I'd like to see us experiment with putting some of the money that we now put into specialized counselors, who have very severe limitations anyhow, because there are never enough of them, into released time for teaching faculty to do some of this counseling, especially as it relates to careers and adaptation to college environment.

Student, to Dr. Smith: You brought up relevancy and ethnic studies, and I was wondering where is the relevancy of ethnic studies? For instance, is it to the black man so he can build his ego, or is it to the white man so he can better understand the black man or the Chicano? Just where is it going to be relevant to students? I want to give an example. Our college took a poll of students. It's a majority of white students. There are some black and some Chicanos, but we took a poll and asked how many would approve of an ethnic studies program, and a vast majority of kids said yes, we approve. In the following question we asked who would take a part in the ethnic studies program, and a very slim minority of students said they wanted to. So if you had an ethnic studies program that nobody participated in, who would it help?

Dr. Smith: I think ethnic studies has to be justified as a part of fundamental education. Even at a school like Merritt in that North Berkeley-Oakland area, which is very oriented to radical movements and very activist, and with something like 2,500 black students on campus there are still only about thirty or forty or fifty of what my brothers would call "nation-builders" who are serious enough to be majoring in Afro-Studies as opposed to majoring in economics or literature or data processing. And this is thirty or forty majors out of perhaps 1,000 enrollees in the black studies program and 450 enrolled in Chicano studies. So certainly even in our kind of institution, which is not typical of the state, you could not depend entirely on the program having its major contributions just to that small in-group of black or brown students. So I don't think that is really a concern. About fifteen percent of the enrollment in the black studies courses is made up of white students, for the most part radical. Over half of the enrollment in the Chicano studies program is made up of white radical students. Of course we have few Chicanos, about 100 as compared to 2,500 black students on campus.

We certainly could not justify the rather vital and large Chicano studies program for 100 students. I do not think they would want to be limited to courses where they would be the only persons exposed to the brown experience. I think strategically we've got to sensitize more of the white students to the nature of the black and brown experience so that they can hopefully have some effect upon the solution to the problem. And the real solution to the problem is having white people go out to all-white communities and change attitudes. Black people and brown people can't do that; so if for no other reason I would say we'd have to insist upon ethnic studies being open to all students, being, as a matter of fact, aggressively pushed as a part of general education. We've got certain of our departments that are now requiring as part of their own sequences one or two courses in Afro-Chicano studies. The behavioral science majors have to take courses, the police science majors have to take courses, the humanities majors have to take courses; and I think that is the way it should be. In the meantime, though, those thirty or forty or fifty "nation-builders," who are concentrating and are really serious about becoming very heavily identified with the subject matter of the black and brown experience, ought to have that opportunity. But again a major is only thirty units out of the ninety quarter units, and I would caution you against concluding that all some black students want to do is spend all day taking black studies. Even if they major in our school, two-thirds of their time would be spent in course work outside of that sequence.

Student, to Dr. Smith: I'd like first to go off on the ethnic studies and then it's going to tie into the question I had about the motives, the traditional motives. The ethnic studies should be, almost like you said, pushed, or almost mandatory because the youths, the adults, everyone has been cheated in a way when it comes to education. We've been cheated inasmuch as we haven't received this portion of education. And it's not a matter of who takes it, it's a matter of everyone should have this. This is one reason I think that you asked for an ethnic studies department plus an incorporation of all the ethnic studies into the regular curriculum. I took History 25 last semester, and there is no black history in there. So in essence I am being cheated. I am taking a semester's course getting three units or whatever, but I am not getting all the history; so I have to go back again and take another course to get the rest of it, take a black studies history course to get that little bit. And so we are being cheated, and until the students, the faculty, the administration stands up and says this has to be incorporated, teachers have to go back to work for a summer and incorporate all the ethnic studies into their courses plus having the make-up course. That would be the ethnic studies department, the make-up. But all ethnic studies should be tied in. And on the motives--

Dr. Smith: Let me say I would agree with you, and I think that as we expand the number of minority instructors, they also need that strength that comes from the solidarity of being in one unit, with some kind of identity and some full-time leadership from a black man who would head that department as opposed to being spread out in five or six other departments where they are kind of an appendage. But at the same time I would recognize that not all colleges have the concentration of people in the community or students that could justify having eight or ten people in ethnic studies as we have. You know there have to be compromises, and you're going to have to substitute direct involvement of faculty by having seminars and bringing in outside people.

Certainly Porterville, for example, can't dream of having a black studies department in practical terms, but they can do somethings to bring in some relevant exposure to the black and brown experience

Student, to Dr. Smith: And on the traditional motives, I think when you are dealing with this, you're dealing with the concept of total education that the youth of today are looking for. They are trying to take their names off the IBM cards that are labeled success and put their names on an IBM card which is labeled total education. And they're finding this not just in the schools, which is a small part of that, and the traditional motives then are to attain these materialistic comforts and everything that everyone wants, like everyone wants a nice house to live in, a nice car, all these materialistic things; but I think young people today are hoping to gain these materialistic things without withdrawing themselves from life itself, without saying, I got mine, now you get yours; because this is what has been going on in the past, and this I think is why you see, like the hippies and everybody like that, they're saying they have this. You know these hippies, they are like weekend slum-goers, you know; cause they can go back to their homes and have their 100 dollars to go eat lunch, this sort of thing. And so they are saying they have theirs but they want to give the rest of the population a chance. And I think this is the difference between the generations, whereas the motives years ago was to attain success, to go to college, get that diploma, and then get those materialistic comforts. But now people want to get materialistic comforts for themselves and not draw themselves from life and deal with that fifteen or twenty percent.

Dr. Smith: Yes, I think certainly black and brown students are saying that they ought to be able to take advantage of the full promise of the American dream without sacrificing their identities, and I think there is no need to have to sacrifice your identity as a black or brown man because you want to develop the tools that will enable you to give leadership to the community, if that is your principal motivation in life, or simply find your own way in life, which after all is perhaps the primary motivation behind exposure to education. I don't think we are really in conflict here. I would say that it might come to a point where black and brown students, because they haven't yet shared fully in the American dream, realize that they can't fully afford the luxury of giving up perhaps their last chance to get hold of some of the tools that will equip them to do whatever they want to do in life. And perhaps they will have to focus on shaking up the institutions that serve society, and maybe the white radical vanguard will be the ones to concentrate on the whole philosophical challenging of the assumptions, since they aren't too well prepared to challenge the institutions directly, certainly not in the urban core cities.

Student, to Dr. Smith: Earlier you mentioned the enrollment of the various minorities at Merritt Junior College, and you mentioned there were thirty-five to forty percent black, two percent Chicanos, ten percent orientals, and the rest, I assume, were whites as the enrollment. What I want to know is, it's an area of concern to me, this two percent to me does not seem indicative of the proportion of the population of the East Bay of the Chicanos. Now, what I want to ask, Is there a reason for this small proportion of enrollment, and if there is, what is being done to increase this?

Dr. Smith: The biggest explanation of this is that we are one of two community colleges in Oakland and our neighboring college, Laney, which is just a couple or three miles across town, has about ten percent Chicano enrollment because it happens to be closer to the East Oakland-Fruitvale barrio, whereas we are in a black ghetto area. I think that is the easiest explanation. The total enrollment of Chicanos in the two colleges is certainly not proportionate to the Chicano high school graduates out of the Oakland-Berkeley area. That's the explanation as I see it. And yet at the same time Merritt has a very comprehensive and vital program in Chicano studies because those 100 or so who have come to Merritt have been more interested in developing that kind of program. Laney still has a very small, integrated over-all approach to ethnic studies and is still struggling to develop a program despite the fact they have six times as many Chicanos as we have at Merritt.

Person in audience, to Dr. Freedman: I wonder if you could expand a little bit more on the late expression of impulses of the twenty-one-year-old and fifteen-to-sixteen-year-old? And the second question, related to that, would be, Do you think it would have been possible for Blake to have affirmed his own humanity and others if possibly he had not gone through the process of mind-expansion and other experiences earlier in his life?

Dr. Freedman: That is a very complex question. I would like to expatiate on some of the things I said during my talk. If you look at various societies throughout the world, most of them put no restrictions on sexual behavior of young people. That is, about nine out of ten societies or cultures allow young people a great deal of sexual freedom. The cultures that do place some restrictions are the highly complex, technological cultures. In primitive societies in various regions of the world--this would be actually most of the regions outside of the Western world--the roles of adults are fairly simple, as I mentioned. By primitive I mean societies in which technology is minimal. The women are housewives or some kind of equivalent. The husbands are farmers, fishermen, hunters. These are tasks that can be learned by young people at relatively early ages. And people assume these adult roles early in life. At age fifteen or sixteen people are getting married, having families, and so forth.

Folk wisdom in the Western World, where, as I indicated, the roles of adults tend to be very complicated and require a long training period, dictated a fair amount of restriction on the freedom of impulse in early life. Using sex as an example, one can argue cogently that a great deal of loosening up is all to the good.

However I think the biggest issue is the age at which this loosening up takes place. I've spent a long time studying students, and in my view those students who as seniors are in the best shape--they are able to be free or controlled as they wish--were not very free early in life, for example, during their high school years.

The crucial issue is whether certain things that happen at an early age, for example, thirteen, do not handicap further development in the personality. And there are many pressures in our society that make things happen early in life.

Part of it again is this old marketing phenomenon. Certain advertisers and various companies are out to expand their market, and if you can sell something to eleven-year-olds or twelve-year-olds, well, all to the good. There is a constant pressure in our society to push things down to earlier and earlier ages, the ages at which people date or drink or use dope or what have you. And a crucial question, you see, is whether indeed certain kinds of experiences with drugs, sex, or whatnot at the very early ages of thirteen, fourteen, and fifteen, may not interfere with subsequent development of complexity and adequate control in the personality.

In the case of Blake himself we don't really know that much about his personal life, but somehow I would guess that probably his experiences in adolescence were rather restricted. He was apprenticed as an engraver, and you know, in those days an apprentice worked very hard. He had very little freedom, and I dare say Blake's notions of freedom came to him in his twenties, and not when he was thirteen and fourteen. I agree that he could not have arrived at the point he did in middle age and old age had he not gone through this long period when freedom of impulse was very important to him. But I don't think it was the freedom that occurred very early in his development.

Student, to Dr. Smith: I would like to make one final remark, and this is in reference to what Dr. Smith had to say, and he spoke about affluent eighty-five percent of the American people making a sacrifice taxwise to bring the other fifteen percent into the system. Well, as far as that goes, you can't have a people, especially the majority, who made the system and who are affluent, make a sacrifice and make that sacrifice willingly or with an understanding. You know you have to understand why you are doing this so you don't lose part of your purpose, because for the affluent white to make a tax sacrifice for black and brown, you know, they are probably looking at it like a chore and then they're saying, well, we have to do it, but I don't want to, you know, and so you still have this misunderstanding. And you've done nothing to solve it except a symbolic gesture. And so I think that this falls on the shoulders of the mass media, but because the mass media is made of individuals, the individuals will have to understand within their realm of influence what they have to do to cause other people to change, because what has been discussed here, especially yesterday, was like this generation gap. I maintain that there is no real generation gap, because anything that anyone might tend to label generation gap falls on either communication or someone's not being able to or willing to get up off of what has been the status quo and to move on to something new.

C. "The Wright Institute Training Program of August and September, 1969," by Dr. Gerald D. Cresci, Dean of Special Programs, Board of Governors, California Community Colleges.

Dr. Briggs wanted me to talk about the Wright Institute Training Program we conducted in August and September of last year.

This was a new experience for the State Office responsible for the governance of the California community colleges. It was an experience we undertook with some fear because it is a sensitive area. It was a program for the training of community college personnel who work with low-income and minority students. The staff in the Chancellor's office were fortunate in contacting the Wright Institute, which had received a special grant from the Federal Government to conduct training programs in this area. It was their plan to conduct one five-week program for community college personnel who worked with low-income and minority youth, but we prevailed upon them to modify their contract with the U.S. Office of Education to conduct five one-week programs in a two-month period. It was a crash program and was needed immediately.

We arrived at this decision on two counts: (1) the Berg-Axtell study emphasized repeatedly the need for training of community college personnel who work with youth who are either from low-income families or minority groups; (2) the passage of the Extended Opportunity Programs and Services Act made it necessary to train individuals for the new programs that would be developed. We knew personnel was not available at the colleges, and we had to do something quickly.

The Wright Institute agreed to our proposal. They put together a staff made up of minority people who knew the problems in this area of training. One objective was the training of individuals who would involve the total college in the program. This included the community.

A second objective was to present alternative means of funding programs. As a matter of fact, there are many things that can be done in this area without money. Of course, we encouraged colleges to get things going with their own resources. The colleges had to demonstrate commitment. There are a number of colleges that we can point to as being illustrative of the work being done with low-income and minority youth, but there are not very many. Actually, the Berg-Axtell study indicated that about half of the community colleges had any viable programs in this field.

Another thing emphasized was that much may be accomplished in the existing structure and we don't have to look outside the community or the college for resources. After all, a community college ought to act like a community college and do the things community colleges are supposed to be doing.

We had our objectives for the training programs. The institutes were held. Within the last few days, I received a communication from the Wright Institute training staff pointing out some general observations regarding the training program.

What I am about to relate to you is not meant to be criticism of the community colleges. Actually, I think it ought to be helpful to you to know what members of one training staff (the Wright Institute) has said and what their impressions and observations were regarding their experience. I also want to point out that the training program was successful and accomplished the objectives. The need for training was recognized and carried out. People were involved that had not been involved before. I think the programs to be developed and those under way received the additional help needed, which will result in improved programs. I feel that many things were accomplished, such as student involvement, colleges observing the need for total involvement and recognizing the necessity for community participation. Additionally, the colleges realized that they could and must not rely on one source of funding. All resources of the community and colleges must be utilized.

The Wright Institute Training Staff returned from the training programs throughout the state with a number of impressions which the staff feels are important to report here.

The California community colleges is the largest system of higher education in the world. They are being called on to take the greatest share of the responsibility for educating low-income and minority youth. They are by nature of their low program cost and flexibility the institution to assume this responsibility. On the other hand the staff saw little or no sense of urgency among the community college personnel in assuming this responsibility. They saw little active participation for assuming assigned tasks, and met with some who felt there were no tasks to be undertaken.

This staff would argue that we are on a collision course between public expectation and college preparation. If poor people and people of color are to be told by the legislature, by four-year institutions, and by high school counselors and community colleges that the community college is their primary chance for an education, and if the community colleges are not prepared to meet that responsibility, the staff is concerned that the community college will not meet the responsibility delegated to them. Senate Bill 164 (the Extended Opportunity Programs and Services Act) and the three million dollars it carries with it is indeed an excellent beginning for the state to move ahead with the state-wide plan for those who have previously been excluded from higher education. Such a plan must take into consideration why poor people and people of color have been excluded. It must recognize that certain changes are essential in the excluding institutions to include and serve a new and different student body.

To be more specific about our concern, the staff was aware of a pervading feeling of impotence among community college faculty and administrators, a feeling of impotence which took the form of, "Nobody funds community colleges. We have no influence with the State Legislature, we have never had enough money, and we aren't going to have enough, and there is no point in talking about anything that has been done at the State College or University because we don't have their freedom."

All these things become a self-filling prophecy. The staff was particularly aware of defeatism on the days devoted to sources of funding and ways of influencing legislation. Repeatedly there was evidence that community colleges exhibited despondency because of a single rejection of a single proposal from one funding source. Not one institution indicated that it was the job of the institution to rework and sell the proposal over and over again. Only one institution reported pushing a financial aid application to the appeal level. All admitted that in the past they asked for less federal financial aid money than they needed.

The staff was even more concerned with some community college personnel because they resisted change by their hyper-sensitivity and defensiveness. For example, in response to a quote from the Southern Education Reporting Service about the small number of black students in higher education, the staff got, "No one on our staff is prejudiced" or "Ours is not a racist institution."

Statements were perceived as accusations where no accusations had been made or intended.

In other cases, participants were passive. They would stay a few hours and then leave for home . Passivity also took the form of several participants asking for model proposals so they could be sure of a good proposal. In other words, there was little evidence of any creative thinking or desire for such in meeting the demands now being felt by the community colleges.

Now on the other hand, students throughout the state selected by other students came for the full five days, took copious notes, worked afternoons and evenings formulating proposals, have since communicated with the staff by asking for information on new legislation; and generally, the paid--or the unpaid students, who were also invited--made the kind of commitment that could bring about change and that represents a marvelous resource to community colleges to move ahead. Students clearly are ready to work very hard to make certain that community colleges include low-income and minority students in their educational opportunity programs, which are being developed and maintained.

The Wright Institute has made several recommendations that I'll relate to you. They indicated that "because three million dollars must serve as a spur to action and because three million dollars split ninety-two ways will be highly ineffectual, the Wright Institute staff makes a number of recommendations based on their experience with several community colleges."

The first recommendation was to give the highest program funding priority to those community colleges which sent full teams and actually participated, and were willing to devote a considerable amount of time to training of personnel. Personnel in this case meaning teaching faculty, administrators, students, and people in the community.

They also pointed out that activity of one single week is not sufficient to influence real change, and follow-up activities should be planned. Institutions should be willing to involve key personnel in large numbers for a specified amount of time. They also suggested that all participants should be committed to change and those who are not willing to seek change should not participate. Sessions can impart a certain amount of factual knowledge, but the bulk of any session should be devoted not to universals, but to the creating of an awareness and a willingness to experiment in change and a willingness to meet new challenges.

The communication declared that all participants should be ready to interact with students and listen to the concerns of students about the need for change. Further, they commented that community colleges should be encouraged to form consortiums. It was pointed out that community colleges will not receive large funding from the Federal Government as individual colleges, but the colleges could if they were to develop consortiums.

The Wright Institute exhorts the Chancellor's Office to exercise all its influence and all its discretion to instigate the change so desperately being called for and to fund programs at those institutions which demonstrate the strongest commitment to change.

The Wright Institute also suggested some of the things they would do differently if called upon to act in this capacity again. They would resist the appeal for institutions to tell them the answers and plan a program for them. This occurred all the time. The question was repeatedly asked, "Now how do we do it?" Colleges wanted answers to problems. The community colleges didn't want to solve their own problems. The Institute would insist that no institution participate unless it participates fully and attempts to plan a program which centers its activity on institutional dialogue. The Institute would serve solely as resource persons and facilitators and not as lecturers.

I have related this communication from the Wright Institute, not as a condemnation or criticism, but as a help. I am merely indicating a reaction of a training team [the Wright Institute] to a given program. Whether these observations are true or not, I will leave to your judgment.

D. Expressions of Thought and Feeling by Representatives of Three Minority Groups.

1. "The First American: The American Indian," by David Risling, Agriculture Instructor, Modesto Junior College, Modesto, California

Why is it the first American, the American Indian, is seldom included in conferences such as this? Is it because we believe that he is part of the mainstream of the American public; is it because we are too busy solving our immediate problems to worry about him; is it because he is one of the "silent majority" who says nothing and is quite pleased with the operation of our present system; or is it that Americans are just apathetic about Indians and their problems?

It is my feeling that the average American is unaware of the American Indian and his problems. When we consider the fact that the educational system in America teaches almost nothing about the Indian, is it any wonder that we continue to neglect the Indian in our educational conferences and other activities?

In viewing the curriculum in our California schools we find almost nothing indicating that Indians contributed anything to the economic or social development of America. Of the five years of studies required for a teaching credential in California, only six and a half pages are devoted to Indians, and five and a half of those are detrimental to the image of the Indian people.

Americans who are aware of the Indians generally feel that most Indians are found in Oklahoma, North Dakota, or Arizona and that the United States government is taking care of them. Unfortunately, this is not the case; almost one-fifth of the Indian population lives in California, and the majority of them live in the urban ghettos.

Edgar Cahn, in his book Our Brother's Keeper: The Indian in White America, says that the Indian is neither an American nor an Indian. He has the worst of one world, the white world, and is barred from the best of his own.

In order for us to help the American Indian we should know a few facts about him. Let us first look at his social and economic status. Let me quote from a campaign speech made by our President to the Congress of American Indians in which he acknowledged the unenviable position of the American Indian. He said:

> The sad plight of the American Indian is a stain on the honor of the American people.
>
> Historically, these native Americans who shared the first Thanksgiving and guided restless explorers across the American continent have been deprived of their ancestral lands and reduced by unfair federal policies and demeaning paternalism to the status of powerless wards of a confused Great White Father.
>
> Today, many of the 600,000 American Indians living on reservations suffer limitations, disabilities and indignities that few disadvantaged groups in America suffer in equal measure.
>
> Their educational level is inexcusably low--and their motivation is sapped by an educational structure which forces them to reject their own culture as the price of educational advancement.

To further illustrate the status of the American Indians as compared to other Americans, I would like to quote to you some other facts: (1) the unemployment rate among Indians is more than ten times the national average; (2) the average family income is $1,500 and in some areas below $500; (3) the literacy rates are the lowest of all ethnic groups, the level of formal education being half the national average and the school drop-out rate, twice the national average; (4) the average life expectancy is more than twenty years less than that of other Americans; (5) the sanitation and housing conditions are the poorest of all ethnic groups, ninety-five percent of the housing being totally inadequate; (6) the death rate among the children is twice the national average; (7) the suicide rate among teenagers in some areas is ten times the national average; (8) urban Indians, many of them relocated by the Federal government, often find themselves confined to hopeless city reservations of despair because they lack the orientation, education, and skills necessary for urban living, hence soon find that they are unwanted; (9) alcoholism, prostitution and other forms of degeneration among Indians are highest in the urban areas.

These cold facts should point out quite clearly the failure of America, as a nation which prides itself in its concern with the welfare of all people, to do something constructive toward overcoming this tragic situation. After all, the deplorable conditions under which the bulk of America's Indian people are forced to exist today are not of their own choosing. They were forced into this miserable situation by the people whose descendents are living in security, comfort, and luxury derived from the rich land and resources taken forcefully and deceitfully from the country's rightful inhabitants.

The next important fact to consider when dealing with American Indians is the fact that they were a conquered people. Conquered people, almost universally, tend to isolate themselves from their conquerors, spatially where possible as well as inwardly or psychologically. They are naturally suspicious in any dealings with people they regard as their conquerors. They tend to develop styles of behavior which cause them to be categorized as apathetic, withdrawn, irresponsible, shy, lazy, and helpless. Alcoholism, inferiority complexes, factionalism, and other forms of degeneration seem to typify such conquered populations--not just

Indians, but any conquered people down through history who have been as completely demoralized over such a long period of time.

Another thing to consider is the fact that the lives of the Indian people have so long been directed and controlled by the government that any display of independence and self-determination is regarded as rebellion against authority; hence the spirit of these once proud, resilient, independent people has been pretty well smothered. This governmental dictation of their lives has left them suspicious, disillusioned, cynical, and frustrated. Their lack of education, naivete, and lack of a sense of self-worth have contributed substantially to their dependency.

That the problems of the Indians are much more complex than those of other minorities is another important fact that should be considered. Indian people are usually subjected to federal, state, local, and Indian laws, all at the same time, many of which are applicable only to Indians. Those that live on trust lands or reservationlands have legal problems unique to Indian people. Many Indians have treaty rights and restrictions that are different from those of other citizens. Some Indians receive federal aid, while others do not. Indians living in the same household sometimes are governed by different agencies. Full brothers and sisters living on and off the reservations find that they have different rules to adhere to. This is very confusing to both the Indian and the non-Indian.

The next thing to consider is the fact that textbooks and the mass media are generally very derogatory toward Indian people. There is little material in the schools today telling of the contributions made by the American Indian toward the development of the United States. Most people are not even aware of the fact that the Iroquois League, established in the 1500's, served as the model for the Constitution of the United States, or that the Cherokee school systems in the early 1800's were teaching classes in their own language and were even more literate in the English language than the surrounding white population at that time.

Such ommissions from our standard textbooks are due, of course, to the fact that Indians are a conquered people and that histories are always written from the conqueror's point of view. Is it any wonder then that we know very little about the original inhabitants of America?

Let us consider next the differing systems of values among people. While some groups of Indians, particularly those of the Northwest, measured a man's success and importance by his material wealth, often earned by his service to others, generally speaking amongst the Indians of the Northern Hemisphere such wealth was of little significance. Things, such as horses, taken by skill and daring, usually signified a man's prowess and courage, which were qualities needed for survival. The present-day American desire for wealth and material things gained through long hours of hard, monotonous work, as a means of measuring a person's importance and success in life, very often does not fit into the Indian system of values. Many would rather have the time and freedom to do the things they enjoy or that they feel are important to their way of life, and they are satisfied with few material things, leaving the tedious work and worry to others. Others feel that it is morally wrong to want or have more than you actually need. Still others feel that it was the white man or "the government" who caused the Indian to be in the predicament in which he finds himself; therefore, it is only right that these same people or agencies should be expected to solve his problems for him. In many cases the Indian tribes have treaties with the Government which promised to take care of them forever.

Another important fact to consider is that Indians have for the most part had their native religions pretty well extinguished and now lack a major religious movement with which to identify. As with religions universally, the Indian religions gradually evolved through time to fit the overall social and environmental complexities of their lives. Every phase of their day-to-day living centered around their religion. With the coming of the conquerors, they were, more often than not, forced to give up their accustomed way of life and their homeland to which their religion was tied, and consequently, to abandon their religion at the same time, or try to modify it to make it acceptable in a changed style of life. The resulting confusion, frustration, and despair had a major effect upon their lives. By and large when Indians came into contact with white people, they were continually pressured into accepting Christianity, in one or more of its many forms, as a superior and "right" replacement for their native religion. Many Indians have had, and are still having, a hard time adjusting to the varying concepts of Christianity, which in many areas are contrary to the Indian philosophy and way of life. This inner conflict leaves them no sustaining religious faith to turn to in times of stress.

The next factor which I will discuss is the lack of self-esteem or self-worth among our Indian people.

One of the reasons for the high Indian unemployment rate and high suicide and drop-out rates among our Indian teenagers is their lack of self-esteem or self-worth and the feeling of not being wanted. There are many contributing causes for this, many of which I have already identified. One of the most notable is the mass media which projects the Indian as being a savage or something less than human. Another factor is the lack of understanding by non-Indian people who know almost nothing factual about the Indian people. In addition the Indian people themselves have lost most of their cultural identity.

Indians concerned with this problem feel that Indian heritage should be an integral part of the programs of the schools and the Indian community. They feel that in teaching the Indians as well as non-Indians the true and finer things about their heritage, stressing that there is nothing shameful in being "different," the Indian people will have a renewed sense of pride in their heritage, in turn improving their own self-esteem and self-worth. This, of course, is a change from the old government philosophy which says that anything Indian is bad and the quicker Indians learned this, the better. Unfortunately this philosophy has only compounded the problem.

The last factor I will discuss which contributes greatly to the low status of the Indians in America today is their lack of opportunity for self-determinatio As a conquered people, they have for generations been under paternalistic control, treated as intellectual, cultural, and social inferiors and have not been given the opportunity to become involved in determining the courses of their own lives.

Yet when the Europeans first landed in this country, the Indians were doing quite well, their ways of life and development of special skills suiting admirably the differing environments in which they lived.

The most successful Indian programs today, such as Rough Rock Demonstration School in Arizona, the California Indian Education Association, the Office of Navajo Economic Opportunity, and many others, are those in which the Indians have taken the leadership role. The least successful are those which have not involved Indians in the planning and management. Unfortunately the dominating society is most reluctant to relinquish its paternalistic role, cherishing the assumption that it must surely know what the Indians need most and what is best for them.

I hope that what I have discussed with you this morning will in some small way cause you to become concerned with the problems of our Indian people. I would suggest that any of you who are interested in the Indian problems read Our Brother's Keeper: The Indians in White America. This book is about the status of these conquered people living among us. It looks at the world which exists today within our midst--a world controlled by white men, a world which grinds out new injustices day by day.[1] It tells the story of how it is to live in your own country, to be a conquered people under control, not being able to determine your own destiny, not even allowed to be heard; as a matter of fact, not even here in the educational system of California. Two years ago we finally had a report made to the Legislature and to the Governor, letting them know there were Indians in California and letting them know their obligations and so on. They did'nt even know that Indians existed. I urge you to read the book, and I further hope that at your next conference you will include the American Indian at all levels so that he too can contribute to the Community College Values Conference. Thank you very much.

2. "Black Aspirations, Goals, and Values," by Joel O. Reid, Dean of Community Services, Pasadena City College

Let us get to the heart of the matter, the gist of the problem, and address ourselves honestly and candidly to what blacks aspire to and really want.

So far as the black man is concerned, I cannot, nor would I pretend to, speak for the blacks in toto. In truth, no one can. There are many leaders, spokesmen, and community representatives who speak out, discuss, and present a rich diversity of opinions regarding aspirations and fulfillment which blacks desire to achieve. Let us not be naive and pretend that there is only one voice for America's blacks and only one point of view. Blacks are as varied in opinion and thought as anyone else. As I see it, the black man is asking and seeking for the same cherished goals and ideals which motivate all other

---

[1] Available from California Indian Education Association, 1349 Crawford Road, Modesto, California 95350. ($2.95 plus 15¢ tax and 15¢ shipping charges)

Americans. These are the same aspirations sought by all other human beings. One important aspect is that of respect, respect as a human being who has a mind; respect as an individual who has talents and the potential for creativity and who seeks to realize his individuality. He wants respect for himself and his family. He wants to better himself, to have a good education, a better home, improved economics. He wants to give his family the comforts and the necessities of living. The black man wants, nay, demands the abolition of discrimination, racism, and exploitation. He cherishes the right and opportunity to participate in and enjoy the benefits and responsibilities of American life.

Let us look at the elementary schools, the fundamental unit of our public school system. There are differing professional and lay citizens' views in the black community. However, they all have in common the desperate and immediate search for progress, not in another 200 years, but progress right here and now! While there may be differences as to the merits of the traditional eight years of elementary school, the 8-4, 6-3-3, and more recently 4-4-4 systems, the important thing is not to get bogged down in educational verbiage and reach an impasse of inaction and apathy. The need is for a responsive system. Blacks are saying, "Let us re-evaluate the educational system, whatever its form, and let us begin to do something constructive about it. Let us change and update its curriculum and subject content." To illustrate, why do we not include a full review in our teaching of American history that would actually represent black participation and contribution at all levels of instruction and from all fields of learning--science, art, politics, etc? Let us use this comprehensive educational approach--the truth--to counter the present distorted view in American education which gives rise to prejudice and feeds race hatred. Let's present these educational truths so that the individual black child, Chicano youth, and all minorities will be proud of the contributions, the richness of his culture and his people. Let us not have showcase nor shallow window-dressing sham. Let us have no "Potemkin Villages." We're living in the 1970's today! Blacks are individuals who have capacity, individuals who are using their capacity, and individuals who should have more opportunity to use their capacity. This is what we want for our children, black, brown, or white.

Now let us direct our attention to the junior high school systems. Let us likewise enrich and modify the school curriculum to make it more meaningful and to make the school system more accountable to its youthful students. The community colleges are becoming more involved in community affairs and extending the educational process to the community at the grass-roots level. This is the essence of the junior college. To me, one of the points of the junior college is to bring education to the people, getting involved in the community. Junior college students are going back to junior high schools and working with potential drop-outs, working with students who are having difficulty because of the system. Why is this so? The educational system as presently constituted has failed to reach and motivate these students. What a waste of talent! What a subversion of the educational process!

In the area of education at the junior college level, let us bring educational opportunity to the people. How do we do this? This is particularly what black people and other minorities in my area are asking. Where junior college administration is enlightened, such as the administration at Pasadena City College, as well as its educational community out-reach, the Community

Adult Training Center, the school system is responsibe to the needs and aspiration of the community peoples. In this sense, it is striving for meaningful communication and accountability to its educational constituents. For example, we are asking for a special program, a mobile classroom on wheels to take into the community. We seek to reach the residents of the ghetto and barrio. Let us sit with the disadvantaged person who has been degraded, who is desperate, who is despairing. Let us make the initial contact with the person who is on drugs and seeks to escape from his harsh world of reality and degradation. Let us meet him on his terms and meet his immediate needs. Let us administer supportive services. Let us have wise lay counselors, recruiters, and other teaching personnel who go out into the community. These personnel will be attached to the mobile classroom. Let all connected with this educational venture be sensitive, concerned, and communicative. This is what black and brown people have been asking for and what they respond to in the area from which I come. This is what the junior college should be trying to do.

After the junior college has established initial contact and created an educational bridge with the community resident, the disadvantaged person will be more responsive to enrolling in the college programs. Let us be realistic and recognize that the stress of the ghetto is such that not everybody wants to go to the junior college, nor could afford the luxury or the time. Survival is paramount. The innovative answer, the response to this need, is the community adult training center, where the educational, economic, and socially disadvantaged can within a short, concentrated time acquire educational and vocational skills so that they can successfully begin to climb the economic ladder and enter the main stream of the employment market.

To be effective and to make such an innovative program work, as we did in Pasadena at our Community Adult Training Center, we must generate enthusiasm and elan vital. We must rid ourselves of stereotyped and prejudicial thinking. For instance, blacks and other minorities do not wish to remain on welfare rolls. They have pride and dignity. They seek a realistic, pragmatic means to escape from the evils of poverty and welfare.

Blacks and other minority youth are keenly aware of the social, economic, and political problems that beset them. They are involved in the political process. They want to help direct their future. This is what young people are asking for. They want to partake in the world of industry, business, and management. They want to acquire more knowledge, expertise, and skills that are so vital to the educational process, especially at the junior college and its educational outpost, the community adult training centers. We educators must be aware of and meet these needs.

The business world has a unique opportunity to get involved and contribute its skills and experience in developing and uplifting the economically deprived communities. Enlightened ghetto youths are saying, Let us be part of the economic decision-making process. In Pasadena, for example, there is the Malabar Parts Corporation that has just started, composed of professional and lay leadership. Malabar utilizes community expertise and skills in redeveloping the community. People, especially young people indigenous to the community, say, Let us do it ourselves. We want a chance to participate in and control our community, our destiny. Instead of our community monies being turned over but two or three times and leaving the community with no profits remaining, let our consumer monies be turned over as it happens in the middle-class areas, thirteen or fourteen times, and a significant portion remain in our community. Malabar and its ghetto youth participants will take the initiative to invite existing business to the community upon mutually acceptable terms and benefits. They will provide not only the unskilled labor force, but also skilled labor and supervisory and management personnel. They will seek educational help and expertise of the Community Adult Training Center and the colleges to achieve this goal of total community participation in all socio-economic spheres of endeavor where the land, buildings, planning, industry, finance, and management are controlled by and for the community.

Blacks and other minorities are saying that there is a lack of sensitivity on the part of most of our educators. There is still discrimination; there is still bigotry; there is still racism. Let us drop the facade of civility and polite language, and let us judge one-another by our actions. There is much truth to the statement "If you are not part of the solution, you are part of the problem." Our lack of meaningful activity, our apathy, our omission is akin to our hoarding of vast surplus quantities of grain while the rest of the world dies of starvation. The grain merely accumulates, but people stagnate and deteriorate. Licensed poverty and injustice perpetuate further poverty and accumulate further injustices onto the second, third, and fourth generations. We have a vicious, unremitting, diabolic cycle. Small wonder that we witness social explosions that erupt into a Watts, a Detroit, a Newark! The expression of good intentions does little if it does not result in constructive actions. The road to Hell is paved with platitudes and hypocrisy. We are judged by our actions and not by pious lip service.

What do blacks and other minorities want? They want their rightful place and share in American life now, no more, but certainly no less. Time is running out! Time is short! All of us must act now with vision, courage, candor, and conviction.

3. "Mexican-Americans," by Amado Reynoso, Spanish instructor and Director of Mexican-American Studies at Moorpark Junior College.

I am Amado Reynoso from Moorpark College, with a couple of different titles; one is instructor in Spanish and one, Director of Mexican-American studies. I'm going to react to Dr. Smith's comments, first of all, in one area which is of great concern to me because of what I have seen happen in a number of ethnic programs and maybe can serve as a base of discussion for some of us instructors, students, and administrators.

Dr. Smith mentioned that students were very concerned and very imaginative and were pushing for many new programs that they considered relevant to them in their own barrios and their own ghettos; and in order to achieve these programs they were going to the administration, and the administration was working with the students in order to achieve these new areas, these new fields of concerns. Well, what I am asking is, Where is the teacher? How are you going to do this? What has happened to the traditional role, to the intimate relation that used to occur between the teacher and the student? How do you go about it? If the administration is the facilitator, it must facilitate something between the student and the teacher. But from a number of institutions since I became involved in ethnic studies last September I hear that teachers are dropping off. They are being attacked by students. You know it's hard being in ethnic studies departments nowdays, both for us blacks and browns, I myself being brown. We may be the first dead generation.

Perhaps two or three years from now it will be realized that some of these more militant--in a negative sense of the word--demands can't be met, and some progress can be made in terms of what can be realized within the structure of the college. Of course the structure itself can change, but new programs are being born every semester, often not being thought out completely. Often they are being met as a reaction to instantaneous demands for instant perfection, and people are being hired and they are being fired, too. Almost overnight they are being reassigned. Things that are built under pressure are drastically changed under pressure, and in this kind of atmosphere, what happens to the teacher? How can you build a viable, long-lasting program for the whites and the blacks and the browns and the barrio and the ghetto, and the over-thirty and the under-thirty, and the day and night students, listening to--necessarily perhaps--to a very small minority of people, the vocal minority?

I had the opportunity of planning, calling, and sharing in a Mexican-American studies conference at Moorpark College last November 19. More than one speaker said, "At our institution we work so closely with our Chicano students that they teach us as much as we teach them" I myself don't feel this way about it. I am wondering who is getting paid and why. I was born in a ghetto. My parents came from Mexico. I am bilingual and bicultural. I have been in education since 1949, and I have been in a number of different districts, and I have some experience that I feel I can offer to young people that may lead them in their own soul-searching for their own identity, in their own careers even as they go back into the ghetto, as they say. Can I offer them anything? I think I can, so I take a job and I want to do my job. I am sure that this is true of all blacks and all browns. If the students don't feel this way, then we are in trouble. If the administration doesn't feel this way, again we are in trouble. How do you recruit, how do you keep, how do you build programs that don't fall down in one semester, that don't fall down in half a semester? What happens to the spirit of the college, is what I'm asking, to the spirit of the staff, the spirit even of the board of this kind of thing?

Bob [speaking to a student in the audience], are you and I the only chicanos here? You want to come up here, Bob? Come on.

Bob: Like in South San Francisco there's almost 4,000 families of Spanish surname, and I think there may be 200 or 300 or even less students in the student body of the College of San Mateo in the three campuses all told. To me this is a very small proportion, and talking myself with a lot of people, fellow Chicanos, I don't think it is all apathy or lack of interest. I just think it's what is available, it's not there; and I think it should be made available because if it isn't, well, shall we say individuals like myself that take a moderate stand, as far as getting things done, may not be heard, and the only thing that may be heard are the ones, let us say, who advocate more violent means.

Reynoso: The ratio in California is about twenty percent Mexican-American, and proportionately we are pretty bad off. The blacks are way ahead of us. We may be better off than the Indians, proportionately, I don't know. It is pretty sad anyway. And for a number of reasons we are not represented.

Now on this same question of why we are not represented, or who we are, or who is speaking up or who can you listen to in building a program meeting the needs of the community, I think that grossly you might be able, in the college area, to divide them into perhaps three different fields, three different piles. One might be the Mexican-American that is pretty closely identified with the Republic of Mexico; and if he is kind of middle-class oriented in Mexico, he is going to come to this country, or middle-class oriented in Cuba, he's going to come to this country and really swing with it from the very beginning. I had youngsters come and learn English in twelve months, and they were in the top of the class right away. No problem at all. If they are Mexican-American and again kind of middle-class oriented they have learned to work with the system and sort of trust the system, and they don't want any rabble rousers to get in their way. And there are then the rabble rousers, the militant ones who are dissatisfied and have some ideas of how they want to change it, and a portion of these will be very vocal. At our college there are maybe five or ten, perhaps, who are quite vocal and assume some kind of leadership. The others are pretty much willing to be identified and be lead by them, or a good portion of them don't even want to be identified with them because of what they consider is a rather negative view of the Mexican-American. They just don't want to be involved in anything militant at all. They are happy to be in sports, to be in technology, to be in social sciences, whatever it is, and not be involved in any Mexican-American studies type thing. Then we have the small minority that is very vocal and is building programs.

What I'm saying, of course, is that we as teachers and we as administrators, in order to earn our keep, have a responsibility to do more than simply listen to them. We have the responsibility to work with them and give them the benefit of whatever experience we may have had. Otherwise the program they are working so hard to build is going to flop because they have no experience in doing this. And if we can help them, if we are committed to building any kind of program, we have to spend many hours with them. And not to do this is to really cheat them and betray them, and they are just going to destroy themselves and nothing is going to be built to last more than one semester. And I feel very strongly about this, because I've seen many instances where administrators, teachers, and college faculty say, well if you want it, sure you can have it, it will fly. But it doesn't fly, and where are you then? So my concern would be with the role of the teacher. How can we at each individual institution best utilize the teacher resources of our colleges? How can we make our ethnic studies program stronger? How can we make our relationship with the community stronger? Those are the concerns I bring to you this morning. Thank-you.

FOURTH SESSION

"As Minority Students See Things," by Student Panel of six: Robert Morales, College of San Mateo; Kenneth Payne, Pasadena City College; Lorraine Pelham, College of the Redwoods; Mel Sanehara, Gavilan College; Wayne Traylor, Pasadena City College; and Zach Zwerdling, College of the Redwoods. Moderator, Sanford Gum, Assistant Dean of the Evening College, College of San Mateo.

Sanford Gum, the Moderator: I will start things off here by relinquishing immediately to the students, because I think that is where it is, and they have heard enough from us. The idea of this panel is more or less a dialogue among ourselves here, hoping to include you too, on how the minority students see things and also kind of a reaction to some of the things we have had foisted on us thus far. I personally feel from the outset that I trust in the future that students will be involved in the planning of these, and I have mentioned that already. O.K., we'll just start off here. Will you tell it how it is for you. Who's going to be first? There don't have to be a first here. Just start in. I know you can rap, but just start like we have been.

Student in audience: What do we as students see that is taking place in the colleges that we are perhaps not satisfied with or if we are satisfied with it, what can we do to make it better? and this is in the realm of--let us say we start off with curriculum--curriculum and ethnic studies.

Wayne Traylor, on panel: O.K., as I mentioned earlier, that one main point is that right now you have to take two or three different courses to get an education in one course actually. Just like all the way through elementary and junior high, and I think with the community college concept this is what we have to start talking about, not just the junior colleges, but the elementary schools and the junior high schools, unless we want to create another mental type generation gap. We have to start thinking about our younger brothers and sisters now, and they're not being taught all that there is to be taught, I mean the teachers could--just like up at Berkeley they have a booklet that's put out already about black history, that if a teacher wants to take a summer off and go and get back into the studying of black history, he could incorporate that into his regular history course. So I see a need for ethnic studies to be incorporated into all the classes and not make the students have to take two or three classes to get one thing.

Bob Morales, on panel: As far as myself, going back to what I said about the proportion of students of Chicano background in the schools, I feel that the administrators and the teachers working in conjunction with the students could make more strides in offering Chicano studies, so that potential students from the barrios, will be encouraged to enroll more and participate more. Since I was in elementary and high school, I have seen a lot done, and yet I see there's still more to be done.

Speaker in audience: Bob, could you give us any background about the College of San Mateo and their College-Readiness Program?"

Bob Morales: The College-Readiness Program was run by Mr. DeLaRocha, a very capable gentleman if I may add, and has done a lot.

Lately I haven't gone on my own to see what is being done, but when I last was involved a lot was being helped. But this is only a drop in the bucket of what can be done as far as promoting more participation, not only by the staff, by the administration, but by the minority students themselves in initiating more ethnic programs. I am not sure, but I believe at the college of San Mateo there isn't a national Chicano program, I mean in the sense that there's a course. I think there is a black studies course being offered, but I didn't notice any Chicano studies offered. A Mr. Marin, fron Skyline College, approached me earlier and asked what my opinion would be, as far as a name for a course. I told him it could be just called Chicano--could be called almost anything, but I feel the most important thing would be to get it actually initiated by talking, by spreading it. In fact I didn't know that they had this need until he talked to me today. But this shows you the problem that there is, not enough awareness going on, because people either remain silent or standing in the background, not voicing themselves, not telling the people how it is.

Speaker in audience: I go along with Bob 100% in everything he's said here. You know it's important that we talk about this stuff, about the issues and about the questions we are trying to raise here. But more important, I think here, is that we commit ourselves, you know; that we really do something. We don't sit around and talk. There is too much talk. In other words what I'm saying is that the key to defeating ignorance and prejudice, and this type of thing, racism, is through education and how you can expect anybody to come through the elementary school structure as it sits or as it stands today, in the United States or in California, and even in the junior college, as it concerns U.S. history. You know what kind of history we are talking about? We are talking about white U.S. history. This is through eighth grade. This is my whole experience in education. This is something that was brought up earlier also; this idea that we're left out, that we're ignored; and we're ignoring a large and wonderful part of our heritage. In other words, we have got to sit down, we've got to say to ourselves that we are going back to our school districts and we are going to work on our Board of Trustees to see that they buy textbooks that are, you know, really textbooks and are telling things the way they are, and talk about history in the real sense of history, not in a one-sided nationalistic thing here. So maybe this is one of the things we should talk about; more than voicing our opinions back home is forcing people to do things, you know, committing--commitments; that's the key word here.

Wayne Traylor: If I could toss something in here, the meaning I grab from that is that now is the time. O.K. What is needed now is you got to show people that something is happening. Just like this conference. If we leave here and nothing's happened, then this is something that the people who you term as militants or you term as being violent, they can look at this conference and tell you that this is why we're being violent; because you are just sitting back, with the rhetoric and all this. So what we need is the therapy of talk for the sake of action. O.K., we talk with some direction, and so this is what's needed.

Probably Lorrain Pelham, on panel: I think that people are aware of so many problems that they don't know really where to start; and one of the problems is how to go about committing yourself personally, not only committing yourself personally, but the measurement. People are so hung up on how to measure progress; for instance, grading. A Mexican-American going through school may be learning an awful lot from where he began; yet he may be failing and turned away from the school because teachers tend to evaluate not personally, but on averages, even in irrelevant subjects. We are going through a mass system where we're in classes that we don't really care about, classes we'll never use, that we have to memorize, and then we are graded on them without considering things that are more relevant to us.

Wayne Traylor: O.K., I would like to make a suggestion here. We are the speakers, you are the audience; you are listening to us. I'd like if possible to change this and now bring it down to where it is at, to communication and dialogue. We had some meetings last night, and we talked some things over and communicated, I think. And we've come up with a statement that Mack Biggers will present to you now, and we'd like you to hear this statement, and then try to--. This is like the key to the discussions that are going to follow at three o'clock, these workshops and things. What we as students are asking is for some action to come out of this conference, something that we can take back to the schools and say that this is what we're trying to do, this is what needs to be done, this sort of thing.

Mack Biggers, a student: As a result of the many discussions that we've had, many students and many faculty and administrators that did join in with us, we came up with a guideline, not a statement of ways and means or programs, or what not, because we realize that different areas have different problems. All we want to do is provide a preamble, and that is a document that will give us a base to work from. And if this is implemented into the feeling of this conference, if this is the feeling of the total group--and this does have the support of the student group that's here--we feel that we will have gained something from this conference other than continous rhetoric. We have some very capable speakers that have spoken before us, but we that are here, that have attended conferences before, we have heard these things. We realize what the problems are; so let's do something. This is nothing more than a guideline.

THE GUIDELINE

Total education is needed at all levels of education.

We the students, as active members of this C.J.C.A. Values Conference, suggest meaningful student involvement and participation in relevant education at all levels. The junior colleges, being the educational institutions of the communities, should be the coordinating entity for all educational movements in their communities to create an efficient educational environment.

Total education involves yesterday, today, and, most important, tomorrow. The community colleges are in a position to initiate educational program through, for example, E.P.I.C., A.S.B., Community Services and administrations.

We believe that the general acceptance of the above suggestions

> as guidelines emenating from this conference would
> greatly enhance the future of our communities

There are students here, faculty members, administrators that have come to a conference--400, 500, 600, miles, some of us. We didn't come because we wanted to have a good time, leave our families during the holidays; we came because we thought something was going to be constructive. Someone said values Conference. Not just a conference like regular conferences, but Values. We're going to start over again. 1970's! The future! We've got something to work for Values. Be they spiritual, ethical, moral--whatever is necessary in order to get the education system in this state where it should be--this is what we've got to do. And these students and the other members that are here that attended these meetings that we had into the wee hours, we got together because we wanted to see a change come about. We started out with long-listed pages of Whereas and Wherefors and Being that--all sorts of programs and whatnot that would be included. O, we felt that because of the diversity of the groups here, the people here, we should have one document here that would work for all people as a base, as a foundation. We've got copies here that are going to be handed out for the discussion groups, and any programs for ways and means of carrying out programs that would come under this should be discussed in these areas.

Are there any questions on what you have just heard that we can answer. Now there are students here. This was not formulated by one or two people. This is a total involvement. And I can't answer all of the questions, but I am sure that if there is a question that someone would like to direct, we can answer them right now. Any of us can. Are there any questions?

Person in audience: I would like to know why the teachers and administrators here should be excluded from the students' meetings?

Unidentified panelist: The faculty and the administrators are not being excluded in that we, as three different groups if you wish to say there are three different groups--although faculty and administrators played a great part in this, we are all trying to arrive at one thing here, and that is Values during this conference.

Person in audience: You haven't been talking about that. You've been talking about race. Ever since I've been at this conference, it's been a racial thing. It's been a racial bag. Now, I want to talk about the white American student who is turning out, you know, I want to talk about--

Unidentified panelist: Wait, wait a minute, wait a minute, wait a minute. What do you see in this guidline that says anything about race?

Person in audience: Listen, man, you misunderstand my statement. I want to talk about---

Unidentified panelist: Excuse me.

Person in audience: --education today--

Unidentified panelist: All right.

Person in audience: --and what's happening on campuses, especially on my campus. There are a lot of students turning away from school. They are not enrolling. They are turning out. A lot of them are on drugs. I want to talk about what's pertinent and what's happening on the campuses. Now, if this is going to be a black conference, we should have stated it. Most of the thing has been ethnics. Why?

Unidentified panelist: O.K.

Person in audience: Perhaps I have missed the point.

Unidentified panelist: I went through this about three weeks ago. Now I had in an office with me, I had some Mexicans, I had some black people, and I had some white people. O.K., so first off, the blacks they were, what they say, militant, you know, and whatever that's supposed to mean. But they were talking about things that were relevant to them. The white kid said, "Oh, there is no place here for me because they are talking bad, you know. No, there is no place here for me." The black kid said, "This thing is too white." The Mexican said, "This is too black."

Person in audience: I contend that if you want to do something, let us do it and stop making excuses! And bring up reasons why. [Applause.]

Unidentified panelist: Now, if there's something you said you wanted to talk about relevant education, talk about it.

Person in audience: All right. Most of the speeches we have had here were from paid speakers, I don't think they've been worth anything because they haven't touched.

Unidentified panelist: Let's talk about now. Relevant education now. O.K., shine on. We haven't had a conference yet. We're turning it into a conference right now. O.K., what are the students' concerns on your campus?

Person in audience: I can tell you what they are concerned about on my campus.

Unidentified panelist: Do it.

Person in audience: O.K., that they are concerned about namely, national situations that we're involved in right now. And this is a big concern. They are concerned about the military; they're concerned about the Vietnam war; they're concerned about the racial thing also. I'm not trying to eliminate that or suppress it in any way. But if this is a values conference, let's keep it that way--a values conference.

Unidentified panelist: Then why don't we just sit down now, and maybe we can outline some of the values that we should be looking for; let's identify some values that we should be talking about here. The idea of this conference is that we come here to discuss values of the 70's, and that hasn't begun yet.

Person in audience: What are values, man?

Unidentified panelist: I mean we've been looking at the problems, and let's look forward to some values; or what I mean is, all the problems fit into the values. O.K.?

Person in audience: I wonder what values mean to you, and maybe we will get this thing straightened out. I have perhaps a certain definition for values or what values certain students have on my campus, what they are talking about, why they're turning away, why they think education is irrelevant to today's youth, and what have you. Now this is what I'm talking about. A lot of students--drugs, for instance, hitting on campus--this is an essential thing. Has it been brought up in this conference? No never. Why?

Another unidentified person in audience: Excuse me. I say that values are irrespective, depending--I mean they are respective, depending on the people that voice them. It's all relative.

Unidentified panelist: Before he starts, let me reiterate here something that we have been stressing as a group--we and many other students out here have been stressing since the first time that we had our first meeting here, is that this statement here is not a black paper or a white paper. This is a students' paper and was formulated by students for students and for the educational communities that our colleges are serving. And anyone who would think that just because there are three black men up here right now means that it's a black--I'm sorry, because it's not. O.K.?

Unidentified speaker: There has been a misconception presented here that we haven't heard anything about drugs or war or anything that has any meaning to students on campuses these days. I think that's a fallacy. I believe Doctor Freedman this morning mentioned Vietnam and the drug scene in his talk. I think yesterday Bishop Kennedy had quite a bit to say about the drug scene and Vietnam and what it's doing within the context of the whole society. Not just concentrating on the problems themselves. This statement contains two concrete values that I think almost everybody and students have. They are two very over-used words--meaningfulness and relevancy. Now a lot of talk goes down that says things aren't meaningful or things aren't relevant. And the words appear again in here. Why don't we just say right now, everybody who has an idea, to make things either more meaningful or more relevant, get up and say it, and then we'll have a conference on values.

Unidentified panelist: O.K. You mentioned that you want relevance. That is one of the underlining [*sic*] things of this whole meeting perhaps. You said to bring up what you feel about it personally; and relevancy to me is sort of another word for pragmatism. We hear all the time about the idealistic views and we're the ones who have the ideas, we're young, we go to school, you know, we have time, we have money, and we have all these wonderful ideals and don't lose hold of these ideals because they are so wonderful. Well, this is all true and wonderful and great. But the thing is we've got to get down and make these ideals meaningful to the community, to ourselves, to education, to our whole lives, and that means you know, pragmatism. And pragmatism in the sense of liberty is no vice. The thing I'm talking about is the heightening of political awareness on campus, something that's pretty new; that is, people are getting pretty concerned about what's happening in the world now and not the football game, and this is moving down to the high schools and the junior colleges; and we have to be the vanguard of it because the junior college is a community college, and that means just what it says, you know: we're in the community. We're the step between the four-year institution and the community. And we can do things, and we can heighten political awareness on campus. We can work in community projects, community services, tutorial programs; we can organize the moratorium and all this type of thing, and it all fits in the same thing, you know: reality. Dealing with the realities of today and that means doing things; not just talking about idealisms.

What I say on that same thing is that all the people in this room have been short changed because of the educational institution, which we have at hand right now. We've all been short changed. The teachers have been all short changed because the students don't come to their class whole heartedly to really learn because they don't really think they are going to learn because all the way through high school we weren't directed to strive toward total education; we were directed to strive towards being a success. No, just like I look at the college prep courses in high-school. Who do these college prep courses go toward? They go toward the middle-class kids primarily. Because the middle-class kids are going to get the A's and the B's, and they are going to be able to get into these college prep courses. So college prep courses is almost something that is not relative to all the people and just like in junior colleges, there's a problem because the students aren't, for say, two years probably three. So, there has to be some type of a coalition between the students, the teachers, and the administration, which we could start, right here at the conference. And, let's see, teachers with ten years [tenure?], they wouldn't have to worry about being fired and could use this freedom that they have to initiate a lot of the programs that students are asking for.

Person in audience: Just a second. Really, while we've been here at this conference, we've been sitting down and we've been questioning the educators that are here. Please could we get some of you educators here to respond--to ask us some questions.

Person in audience: Hit him.

Student in audience. I hope everybody is loose. Loosen up. Take a deep breath. It's not a big thing. I'd like to quote something. I was called in three days ago and told that I was going to come to this conference, and I had no idea what it was going to be about. First of all I would like to come out and quote what values are, and I found this in Webster's this morning when I was looking it up--I had nothing else to do: "That quality of a thing which makes it more or less desirable or useful," etc. I had been here for a day now, and I have listened to a number of speakers and I have looked for something that I could take back to my college, to my students, and to my community, and this is where it's at--I want something to take back. I get right up here. I have got to loosen up a little bit. I don't get in front of a microphone very often, and when I do, I get, you know, a little bit tight. I spent too much time in the service just talking to men over a cup of coffee and not in front of people who are well educated. But I think it is the part of the administration and the faculty to help us on this problem. There is a great deal of student apathy, and we need to institute a program in the college community that will get the students active. We can start this on the small scale that was brought to my sight last night, but it has to be the part of the faculty as a helper and the student as a worker. I think we have to get together here and do something.

I have some things to bring back to help out next semester, but I think that most of the faculty has something here that could be offered, too. And I wish you people would come up here and give us some of your ideas. Here are some of our ideas, and let us get loose and make this a conference.

Person on panel: Could I say something? I feel uncomfortable up here, and I think the situation of speaker to audience isn't as effective as it should be. I would like to break up and really get talking, and it's really hard for me to sit up here and talk to all of you.

Another person: The thing is that it is planned, and what we can use this for is to gain ideas for the group, because at 3:00 o'clock they are having a workshop.

Person on panel: But that workshop is so small in the time in comparison to all of these speeches. I mean, I think we should have well-informed people to come, but I think they should, you know, get into these small groups instead of, you know, speaking to everybody, and it is really difficult for me to, you know. It takes a really good listener, you know, to--I don't know.

Student in audience, at microphone: I'm not going to recognize any hands. You want to speak, you get the hell up here like I had to do. Now look, I'm tired of this crap going on. I can stand up here, and I can say I want to bring something back. Wow! What in the hell am I going to do if my administration squashed me? Now, we are trying to get something constructive out of this thing, and I think that the faculty and the administration think that this is a game. It's no game any more, baby! I stayed up until 3:30 in the morning like the rest of these guys up there playing the game, trying to get this thing formulated; and at lunch time, I find out that most of you people already know what in the hell was coming off. You knew it was coming. You can sit in your carousel [sic] and you can go back to your college and you can sit in your office, you can go in your classroom, and you can say "The hell with those bastards! They don't mean a thing to me." And I am telling you right now that you are the people who catch all the hell on all your colleges. You are the people who get the colleges burned down. We have to pay the hell because we want to find out the truth. We want to find out who started blood plasma. It was a black man. It wasn't no white man. I didn't learn that in school. Dick Gregory told me that. I heard about Indians. I heard these people up there. I got to bitch with them too. They sit up there and talk about Chicano and black studies. I only heard Mr. Risling talk about the Indians, the founding fathers of this country. Not George Washington. I am a little up tight about this whole stinking thing. You know it! I come up here with ideals. I come up here with values. I didn't expect anything because I didn't know what to expect. I was told you are going to a values conference, spiritual leadership, and morals. You people are trying to stick your archaic morals on us. They don't work! If you don't realize that by now, forget it!

Student in audience: May I say something?

Student at microphone: Go ahead.

Student in audience: If we are going to get something out of this, we musn't be suspicious. You must have some faith if this is going to work. You must trust these other people. You must know that we are all asking the same questions. We may have different answers, but no one is here insincerely. I think that everyone came here knowing that we wanted to be together and we wanted to talk things out and your ideas are no better than anybody else's and I--and you have no right to criticize them. [Applause.]

Student at microphone O.K., that's cool. Let's squash the little petty kid games. Let's get down to it.

Person in audience: I share his frustration, but I don't, probably because I'm older, share in the degree of, of being up as tight as you are. Let me---

Student at microphone: This was my whole point. Look! Just let me get one thing clear, please. I got up here because when that thing [The Guideline] was being read, I looked around at the faces of the faculty and the administration. I'm not a guy who sits up here and puts his own morals and ideas on something. I looked around and saw the expressions. When I see blank faces, it just turns me off.

Person in audience: But let me say something. I carry back the same frustrations he will. But I must say I'm one of these administrators who he says is sitting in an ivory tower, who isn't effective. I would like to put it straight right now. That I am as frustrated as anyone else is. Because of the vast group of our students who are in our colleges who are inactivated, who cannot be moved to action. I am frustrated by a vast group of many of my colleagues who cannot be moved to action. I need help just as much as any individual does. The values are there, but there is a degree of frustration. Where are these other students?

Another person: You going to give me a chance now? I have been up here seventeen and a half minutes, waiting for an opportunity to speak. I think we are playing a game. I think we all play games and of various kinds, and it looks like this game is one which has an inning. You know, the teachers and the administrators are up to bat for a while, and the rest of us sit in the stands and watch them; and then the students are up to bat, and we sit and watch them. I think if we recognize that we are playing a game, there may be some things that we need to also recognize and that's we need some rules and some guidelines. We have used a lot of cliches. The students have a difficult task of sitting up here and thinking of things that are significant and relevant and valuable and acceptable, and all the other things that we try to do. And the idea of defining value is something that people have been wrestling with for centuries; and to expect that we are going to come up here and all of a sudden come out with a list of values is very difficult and perhaps too much to expect. But I think there are some things that would help us arrive at these conclusions. And those were outlined at the very first speech that was made at this conference. And that's what we need, to develop some guidelines for the determination of values. And secondly we need to develop some methods of evaluating these values that are presented. And it seems to me that unless we come up with some sort of a framework for consideration, that we aren't going to get very far. I think perhaps one of the things that we could do that would be constructive would, say--all right, if a value comes up, we will say that the value we have been talking about, here, considerably and that's the right of the individual. All right.

In what sort of a framework are you going to determine that as a value? Just listing a series of values isn't the thing perhaps that we need first. We need to have a framework to which these things can be fit. And I agree with the gentleman here that mentioned a while ago that our continuing to sit here and talk isn't accomplishing a heck of a lot. Unless we can, in some way, draw up some rules by which we are going to play this game and all of us get into the thing rather than having them talk, then having us talk, and them talk, and we talk, can't we maybe divide into these sections early and start working on these things right away, because I don't feel we are accomplishing much more right now than we did all morning. [Applause.]

Moderator: There is, there is a request that the students hold off from talking and let a couple of the faculty members get up here just for a second.

Person in audience, probably a teacher: I am not too sure I am following through on the previous speakers suggestion, but as I was listening to one of the earlier speakers who talked about pragmatism, I started writing on the back of this sheet, and I would suggest that over the period of time that we have been together, at least some values have emerged, from not only the evening meeting and some of the lounges, but also listening to some of the speakers here. And I would like to ask some questions which you may wish to interpret in terms of answers, or rather suggestions, and do as you wish on that, but I would say they are related to some of the values that we have already at least passingly, agreed to during the short time we have been together. I would like to ask, for example, what have boards done, governing boards in junior colleges, to make use of community service funds for the benefit of helping the minority and previously untouched groups in the community; if the boards really believe that education is a right and not a privilege? I ask, What have faculties done to demand in service programs for themselves and their colleagues in order to learn more about minority groups, if they believe that education is a right and not a privilege for all the community that they serve? I would like thirdly to ask, What have students senates done to reassess their budget in order to allocate funds for financial aids to their peers rather than to their pom-pom girl uniforms, if they believe that education is a right, not a privilege, for all in their community? What have students done to insist on participating in curriculum development at the departmental level, if they believe that involvement in curriculum development is of student concern? Fifth, I would say, what have board members done to take the leadership as lay citizens, in order to insist that community concepts and commitments be revised to the 1970's? Sixth, what has been done to incorporate off-campus agencies, such as campus ministries, human relations councils, Y centers, which are already miles ahead of the community in many areas in the state of California?

Moderator: I would like to take the perogative [*sic*] as the moderator, my one duty here, to turn this meeting back to our chairman. She's going to tell us where our groups will go and we will take off from here. Please.

Person in audience: May I just ask one question? When we go in these workshops, I believe we would get more accomplished if we spoke from either--from our personal experience or our personal commitments of what we have done. This problem hasn't just come up today, these problems haven't just come up today. If we speak from awareness, not from what they haven't done; what this person hasn't done or what that group hasn't done, if we speak from what we have done and what we would like to share, we may find the flaws

Chairman: Thank you I think that's an excellent suggestion

FIFTH SESSION

A Report on afternoon workshops by workshop chairmen or designates

Reporter for Workshop No 1, John Pitheo. What we talked about cannot be really summarized in one or two words, because, we covered quite a few points We talked about student involvement in many ways many aspects of campus life We talked about electing a member of the student body for the board of trustees of the junior colleges, and this is the only thing we really didn't come to any agreement on Most of the other points dealt with the things such as institution of a program for elementary and secondary and grade kids in the area of these junior colleges by the students of the college Some points were brought up as to the fact that this type of a program already exists in several of the junior colleges, not only because of its advantage to the members of the community around, but also to the students from the junior colleges Another point was what should be done as to the teaching of different types of ethnic courses, and one of the points that was brought up was that an expert type of teacher, instructors who are members of these ethnic groups that give these lectures or classes, and since there aren't so many qualified instructors, that we should have them on a temporary basis where they will go one or two semesters to one college and then go to another college and teach this type of a course So this is about what we talked about We also talked about financial matters, about the way the students handle financial matters, about involvement and decisions in financial matters, and, really, you can't summarize That about wraps it up

Reporter for Workshop No 2, Mary Alice Geier The role of professional educators is to stimulate and facilitate the personal growth of the student, to help draw out his potential for full experience and enjoyment of life rather than seeking only to transmit facts or personal philosophies It is the role of educational institutions to work with all other formal and informal institutions to provide leadership and guidance necessary for the growth of college and communities For the institution to provide leadership would mean (1) interpreting to a community the major issue of total education, (2) providing leadership in community-centered projects, (3) actively recruiting their counseling educationally at its advantage; (4) radically expanding of teaching to service a large variety of learning types, (5) encouraging continuity of instruction between the secondary schools and community colleges, (6) enabling campus groups to affiliate with appropriate off-campus organizations The students would be provided with an environment in which to seek personal and human fulfillment of life (values, purpose, and goals) and should be encouraged to take an active role in the educational structure itself, in his local community, and in the problems and needs of his own time

Involvement and participation in the educational process would mean assisting in the selection of all professional staff of a community college; voting membership on all administrative and faculty councils, committees, and departments, membership on local boards of trustees, and representation on the Board of Governors of California Community Colleges It is recommended, therefore that the C J C A Values Committee request the Western Association of Schools and Colleges to develop criteria to the degree to which each college has encouraged and facilitated the active participation of students in its governments [Applause

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

General Chairman of Workshops, Dr. Leady Clark: I think that what we can do is pass this on to the chairman of the C.J.C.A. Committee on Values to submit to the C.J.C.A. body. The resolution in the minutes of the Fourth Session will go to C.J.C.A.

Reporter for Workshop No. 3, Lelia Jamison: We began by acknowledging that comment is good, that our society is still open, and that opportunities still abound. America's history has been a series of reforms, and it is possible that we are on the threshold of reform in peoples' treatment of people. Over the long haul perhaps pressures can be brought to bear to enforce the reforms that we are seeking here. But we must continuously develop a broader credibility base by confronting people with the seriousness of the problems that face us. Two of the problems that we identified were the dehumanization of so many facets of American life by such things as genetics and psychological manipulation; and the problem of work in the 70's in an increasingly leisure-oriented world. We would hope that the students here would be aware of the attempts that are being made to implement values, even if we are not wholly or even partially successful in our attempt. We also wish to affirm the statement that was made and distributed by the students; and we felt that they really let us off pretty easy, that there were more criticisms they could have made. We are hoping that the students will carry back to their campuses the news or the reports of the involvement with the younger students that have been reported to us by some of the students. The message from Group 3 would be, "Can you hear me?" And what we began with was that nothing is impossible. [Applause.]

Reporter for Workshop No. 4, Dr. Loren Phillips: We had a rather pragmatic group, and therefore, some of these recommendations or values are not very lofty values, not probably as lofty as some of those that we heard. They call for some very practical things, such as remedial programs that we feel should help the educationally disadvantaged and carry them on from there to fast, high-comprehension reading; programs that will help those who come ill-prepared to the junior college and who cannot really succeed unless they have special help. We also call for tutorial programs of a nature that will help students, and feel that this should be a significant part of the effort of teachers and students. We feel that programs must be instituted which give students a sense of worth as individuals, as people who are listened to and have a very definite place in the formulation of college policy and the implementation of the procedures of the college. We feel that students should serve as voting members of all college committees excepting possibly those which are inappropriate for them, for instance the scholastic standards committee, when the individual is being discussed as to whether or not they'll be retained in the school, and so on. The school code forbids this excepting for staff members, but otherwise, we feel that they should have sweeping representation. They cannot be voting members of the board, but we feel that they should sit with the board as consultants, people who can break into the board sessions by merely raising their hand and can be a real help to the board. We especially commend the students who drew up this policy calling for total education, and although this might not be popular with all, we look forward to the day when there will not be a Black Studies program or a Chicano or an Indian program, but that the rightful place of the black man, the Indian, the Chicano, the Oriental will be written into the history of the country and that these courses will put them in their rightful place without having to segregate. Of course, we believe in freedom of speech and freedom of choice and feel that possibly there should be a moderation, a lessening, of those courses which the students who do not feel are relevant and which are not essential to the development of a profession or vocational curriculum. In other words, maybe you don't like anatomy, but I am afraid you are going to have to take it if you are going to become a doctor. Other than that, we feel that wider and wider ranges of courses should be provided and much more freedom of choice than heretofore should be granted. And we feel that teachers should give of themselves, not only as textbooks wired for sound, but as warm, compassionate people with empathy to the student, who will listen to their problems, who will get close to them. And we mentioned today that some of these new colleges that have very poor facilities, that are just getting started, they might live in temporary facilities or barracks, but nevertheless there is that warm personal relationship and expectation that we find so often in the faculty and among the students that is hard to recapture and that we should again recapture if we're going to have peace on the campus. And we feel that by respecting human beings, if you really respect and love human beings, then you are moral.

Finally we feel that the associated students probably--not probably, but certainly--should give more emphasis to significant, relevant issues and put their time and their money into these areas. And it was brought up that maybe a religious emphasis week might be a good thing on some campuses. I know on one four-year campus, where I spent four years, twelve years rather, that religious week was a part of their life, and eventually they dropped it for certain reasons. But I'm speaking of religious emphasis week; we don't mean only the Christian religion, but any religious viewpoints which people might want presented.

Reporter from Workshop No. 5, Pamela J. Evans: We mainly discussed the theme of values. And it was a little hard because we seemed to get more philosophical than getting down to an exact system. What can be done? How can we do it? We seemed to be saying this is the way it should be, but then we realized that people are all different, and it can't exactly be a utopia like we would want it to be. But this brought us toward definitions of various things, like "total education," which the students passed out. And we found that the definition led into a language problem between people, which immediately set up blocks and walls in front of other people, which means a language barrier and their lack of communication. We found ourselves going around in circles like this until after it was time to leave; but that was very interesting. "Total education," that particular phrase indicated to us that there is a definite difference between a man with an education and an educated man, because in a college it's very important that you follow the curriculum and you'd get a lot out of it. But we found that there's another life outside of the college, too, and sometimes it's awfully hard, especially for the students who have just entered the college, to adjust to it. Then again, expounding upon other things that the community needs to respond to the college as well as the college to the community, and there are various ways of doing this. And it needs student help as well as faculty and administration. There were basically three ways of doing it: the student not only helped himself, but he helped a child of his community, and he helped the parents of that child. In turn he raised the standard of our college to that community. And last of all, that the college citizen and the community citizens, whether administrative, faculty, or student, are to work together in a democratic society, which really our colleges are. [Applause.]

Reporter for Workshop No. 6, James Thomas: First, we responded to the student statement. Can we as a body undersign this statement? We took this very seriously. With an eye to the possibility of undersigning it, we would call for clarification and specification as follows: (1) clarification of the meaning of "total education," including the question of religion; (2) clarification of student involvement in "all levels," what they mean by that; and (3) clarification of "relevancy"--who is to decide relevancy? We suggested perhaps a combination of students, faculty, and community. We would like to include, or suggest that we include a statement of faculty responsibility for making courses relevant and support the students' right to demand relevancy. We should also like to include after the words and administration, we'd like to include and boards of trustees.

We put together, as far as I can get through them in the next few seconds, some values that we saw that we should be promoting. We decided that values are best taught by practicing them. (1) The teacher should demonstrate his integrity; he should allow choices in decision making; he should call for students to prepare their own values; he should inform students of the rules of the course, or, better, encourage them to participate in the design of the course, and then live up to these designs. (2) Another value: we should allow for expression of a diversity of values. We should respect a diversity of tastes, styles, and beliefs. We believe that learning is enriched by a diversity of cultural expressions. (3) We must insist upon the value of the individual and his right to an opportunity to full participation in society. (4) We must promote the right of the individual to make his own choices and also his right to change his choices. (5) We call for the exploration of the question of the right of the individual versus the common good. We ask this question with the right to self-determination in mind. (6) We urge individuals to strive for personal confidence in their self-worth. (7) We express a concern for the welfare and justice of all segments of society--we must develop a sensitivity to the feelings of others. (8) We must develop an appreciation for beauty, an appreciation for the mystery and the wonder of the unknown; we must develop a humility before the mystery of the universe; we must call for law and order with justice. We urge that stands or positions be made on principle rather than expediency. And then, last, we recognize the universal need for a close-caring relationship in all of our functions. This relationship is best characterized by love in its ideal expression. [Applause]

Reporter for Workshop No. 7, Mack Biggers: Group No. 7 felt, and it was unanimous, that the student values Guidelines should be accepted and adopted as a preamble to the conclusions of this conference, with some wording changes, because after discussing this, it was found that we came up with just about the same problems with wording as those of the preceding group. But we offered these changes in the wording: about line four, "The junior colleges, being the educational institutions of the communities, should provide comprehensive educational programs to create an efficient educational environment within their communities." [This is the way the group proposed that the sentence read.] Two lines down, "The community colleges are in a position to initiate broad community educational programs by coordinated utilization of the resources of campus and community." [Again, this is the group's proposal.] Also, since we had a statement of student guidelines--values, we are going to initiate institutional values. (a) Reaffirm concern for the common man--one, open door policy; two, internal democracy; three, relevant education. (b) Reaffirm responsibility for

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

the community--one, facilities; two, community action programs; three, cooperation with social agencies and community groups. (c) Emphasize human development and not just manpower development--one, ethnic studies; two, evaluate funded programs in terms of institutional philosophy, not letting funding determine direction. [Applause.]

Reporter for Workshop No. 8, Randy Lane: Group 8 felt that the highest value was the worth of the individual and that all other values pointed to this one. Some of the other values mentioned, then, were that education can help an individual reach his highest potential. Another point was made: the students should help in the development of their educational programs in reaching their potential by participation in the decision making. And education should be meaningful. We felt that often it wastes both the students' and the instructor's time. The values are taught primarily by living the values and it really doesn't matter what a person says; it's what he lives that counts. We should insist on intellectual honesty in teaching and in the printed material. [Applause.]

Reporter for Workshop No. 9, Wayne Barton: One observation by me as the workshop chairman would be this: certainly we found ourselves turning back on values that we've heard about before. One just mentioned in the report from conference committee No. 8, the dignity and worth of the individual, the right of self-determination, the worth of mutual support and cooperation among members of the college and the community. There was expressed there a belief in the community college as an effective agent of social changes, and confidence in the capabilities of community college students, faculty, administrators, and board members to facilitate the necessary changes by working together. The emphasis of the discussion was fully, I believe, on action orientation--the need for action, for positive response to the problems of society and through this response demonstrate the values of our society. I'll enumerate a few specific projects that were mentioned that underscore somewhat the significance of the individual in the deliberations that went on. There was an interest in assisting young people throughout society with their educational program, and in this, mention was made of community college student work in the elementary schools and the high schools. More people-to-people contact was emphasized, contact student to student, teacher to teacher; need for a greater cooperation between faculty and student senates, for more involvement of students and faculty in local community board of education meetings and decisions, reflecting the importance of involvement, and the emphasis on self-determination. There was also mention made of the importance of faculty responsibility in looking toward the moral issues of our day and developing programs within the faculty senates and the faculty groups to help illuminate important moral values. More involvement and participation in local community affairs and problems rather than remote and intangible issues; re-evaluation of board policies by faculty and student senate committees and administrative committees; an effort to draw on community resources to help provide an education relevant to current social issues and trends; need for all community colleges to develop human relations classes and seminars directed toward action projects; need for direct attention in classes and informal sessions to current moral issues; the need for the college to communicate with parents about programs and student needs; and the need for colleges to re-evaluate statements of philosophy and purposes to assure their current relevance. The workshop group did go on record as endorsing the student statement of conference concerns. [Applause.]

Reporter for Workshop No. 10, Stanley McDaniel: The discussion of group 10 was almost entirely abstract and limited to institutional values. The discussion may be expressed in four value statements, the first three dealing with the institutional values toward the individual, and the fourth, values toward the community as a whole. The group believed that the community college should in word and deed affirm the right of every person to become all he potentially is, and, secondly, that the community college should be so structured to encourage the student to become humanly involved in a learning experience. Number three, the community college should show the individual how he can evaluate his own role in society and also be able to appreciate an experience of the abundant life that is available in this world. And number four, which is related to the entire community in which the college exists, the college should provide education and leadership which enables it to become effectively involved in community development and also to evaluate the viability of institutions that are political, industrial, social, and religious that do exist in that same community with the community college. [Applause.]

Reporter for Workshop No. 11, Mike Carter: We first tried to define the statement and felt that we were getting quite complicated and involved. So we resolved to come up with some definitions of values. Some of these we might define as a basic set of beliefs to which an individual or a group subscribe: faith in a supreme being, dignity and respect, love, for the highest good of everyone. Having these values in mind, we went on to answer two questions: What can the junior college do, and how can it accomplish the things it should do? These are (1) provide involvement opportunities for faculty and students to make the community college the servant of the people; (2) provide a tutorial program for all students in the community; (3) have some method of counseling students to determine their needs; then (4) carry the answers to these needs into the program; and (5) provide programs that cater to individual differences. We then came up with a very scholarly decision, which will be printed, broad enough to let us do anything we want to do or to let us go ahead and just not do anything. [Applause.]

Reporter for Workshop No. 12, Mike Davis: We were very down to earth. We decided we should take a poll of students on instructor evaluations, and if this proved out, to establish a program of instructor evaluations; and I have it written for the Desert RamPage, which will be distributed in my school. Tutoring for primary and secondary students and establishing a program of students going to convalescent homes and hospitals to discuss the ethnic hang-up of--I believe this is the brown people--that sometimes is instilled in the child that he is a sissy if he reaches out for education. And we thought this could be taken care of by the college student going into the secondary and primary schools and helping the child in education. The establishment of student and faculty speakers in the community clubs is to try and bring the eye of the community onto the community college, and this should be done by black, brown, and white factions of the community college. Committees established by the administration and faculty have put off students, and we wondered if the professional part of these committees were helping the students to be more effective on those committees as we thought they should be; and the establishment of student-teacher relationships, I thought this would be from the free speech area and possibly getting the instructor into the focal area where the students congregate. [Applause.]

Reporter for Workshop for No. 13 and No. 14, which met together, Patricia Patterson: Our discussion centered around the student statement of values, and we had a very interesting group, because we were split just about down the middle between administrators and students, both of whom were very vocal. And as we approached the statement, some of the administrators thought that it was terribly utopian, it was perhaps meaningless, the terms were not clear, and the students thought very much the other way. I think though by the end of the hour and-a-half discussion we were very much in accord, and our group does stand for acceptance of the statement.

Getting down to specifics, we had a very interesting discussion about what is meant by *relevant*. Do you talk about relevance on a local level or do you talk about things that are universally relevant, such as the race-relation problem? We didn't come up with any firm definition. We thought that each college campus should treat with things that are both locally relevant and universally relevant. We discussed the question of how students could obtain more power, because the statement said that this is all very well, but unless you can implement it, it's not worth anything. And we felt that students should become voting members of boards of education, and we actually got down to legal points of how this could be accomplished--what barriers were there and how you could get by this. We felt that students should not only meet with administrators to come to some kind of solution to obtain more power in decision making in colleges, but that the faculty many times was a larger road block, and that rather than taking a program simply to the administrators, they should try to get on the faculty committees, because in many cases this is where the power actually lies. We felt that ethnic study should be taught as part of the total program. In other words, don't teach black history or Spanish American history over here and then regular history over here. It should all be together. We discussed the purpose of ethnic programs. Some people have the impression that, for instance, blacks should take a program in ethnic studies so that they can go back into the ghetto. And we had some black participants tell us why this simply was not so, that everybody has the same aspirations. They want to get ahead in the world; they want to come out from where they have been and proceed forward; and that if they can look back and take some other people out of the ghetto, this is a very fine purpose. But they do not go back. They cannot go back. We discussed the problem of student government and why it is so apathetic. We came to the conclusion it's because they oftentimes don't tackle the real issues. A real issue might be deciding to take the funds which are, say, normally expended on football and athletic activities and, say, we don't want to do this; we want to set up a minority program right now. And I think it would cause a lot of fireworks, but it might be kind of interesting. I guess that's about it. As I said in the beginning, our group wants to endorse the statement for acceptance by the conference. [Applause.]

Reporter for Workshop No. 15, Dr. Dale A. Miller: The best way I can summarize our report is to ask you to review in your own minds the thirteen previous reports, and the best points brought up were discussed by our group.

One of our biggest concerns, one that perhaps needs a little more emphasis, is the values that could be derived from people helping other people. I think our student representative stated it best when he said, "I learned a little bit more about myself by helping others." His appeal was not just to toils [?], but many other expanded opportunities for the junior colleges in the community. I think this is what the value statement meant by total education. Our group, as the other groups, felt that it was a good statement and that there were some terms that needed further definition, but that we agreed with it.

We spent considerable time in making suggestions and recommendations for further conferences of this sort, and we might just mention that we saw the C.J.C.A. area conferences as an excellent vehicle for prior planning and getting expanded involvement before we come to the group get-together.

Speaker from Workshops No. 13 and 14, Mr. Snelgrove: I almost feel that I am going to be redundant in saying what I have to say now, but groups 13 and 14 felt that we should go a step further in our discussion of the student statement of values that was distributed this afternoon. We felt, although there were terms in it that could stand further definition, that perhaps needed clarification, a statement that did not need some clarification for some people would be unwritable. These people were not professionals--we felt that this is a constructive, thoughtful presentation. Therefore I would like to make a motion at this time that this conference accept and confirm by voice vote the intent of this statement. (A second is heard from the audience.)

Chairman of the Conference, Dr. Ellsworth Briggs: As chairman of the conference I would be entitled to accept that motion and a second. I think you've understood what the different groups indicated. We could quibble over words, but this is not the point. We want to indicate that we are united in our intent. You have heard the motion and the second. How many are in favor, indicate by voice. (A strong response of "aye" from the audience.) Opposed, same sign. (No response.) We are unanimous in our decision. And I want to say one final word as I thank our workshop chairman for the fine work she has done here, that what you've seen on the stage tonight is evidence of the unity of the junior colleges, students, faculty, and administration. (Applause.)

B. "Campus Unrest: Confrontation or Communication," by William H. Orrick, Jr., prominent San Francisco attorney, former assistant Attorney General of the United States, Civil and Anti-Trust divisions, civic leader and churchman; author of Shut it Down: A College in Crises (San Francisco State College).

I have enjoyed enormously being at this conference today, and particularly this evening, to hear the results of the workshops and the varying types of values and the diversity of approaches that the groups made. I also enjoyed the very informative, interesting, and stimulating talks I heard this morning, as well as the panel discussion this afternoon, though I must say that I learned a little more than I cared to know about how some of the members of the conference liked speeches. Nonetheless, with trepidation I am going to hope that you will indulge me, as I am not a student, I am not a member of the faculty, and I am not an administrator.

My experience as a lawyer has taught me to exercise the greatest care in assuming the mantle of an expert. And this is particularly true with regard to the general subject of higher education. So I am going to open my remarks tonight by qualifying as a non-expert, but nevertheless, a Californian sharing the general concern for the quality of our educational institutions, whether they be in California or elsewhere in the Nation

Underlying the topic which you've given to me, "Campus Unrest: Confrontation or Communication," is the concept of group violence To me, at least, a confrontation is a means, albeit not a very pleasant one, of communication. If the confrontation does not result in group violence, then there's a good chance that the problems creating the campus unrest may be dealt with by communication But the terms campus unrest and confrontation all too often in the lexicon of the layman mean group violence And so tonight I intend in the first part of my speech to talk briefly on group violence--what it is and what it does and how it occurred on the San Francisco State Campus about a year ago Then in the second part of my talk, I shall discuss briefly some of the causes of campus unrest, and, as a non-expert, I shall pose certain questions.

First on group violence Group violence is the close companion of anarchy. There is, of course, nothing new in America, or indeed in the world, about group violence It has accompanied periods of social unrest from the time of Homer to this morning's newspaper, as the Violence Commission has put it, and in America we're all too familiar with it Ever since the Boston Tea Party, group violence has recurred in America--the Whisky Rebellion, John Brown's raid at Harper's Ferry, the lynching of blacks at the rate of almost 100 a year from 1890 to 1910, the violence of the Vigilantes in San Francisco, the labor violence in the 1930's and before, and the campus disturbances of the past few years--just to cite a few examples

Group violence is dangerous to a free society It has no protected legal status, and, most important, it's not a necessary consequence of group protest. And I want to underscore this point, because there are many people in our society who decry the one as though it were the other The right to protest is an indispensable element in a free society The exercise of that right is essential to the health of the body politic and its ability to adapt itself to a changing environment In this country we have endowed the right of protest with constitutional status The First Amendment to the Constitution protects freedom of speech and press and the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the government for a redress of grievances And the Amendment protects more than an individual's right to dissent; it guarantees the right of groups to assemble and petition or in the more modern phrase, to demonstrate. But group violence, as distinguished from group protest, cannot and will not be tolerated whether on the campus or in the streets Militants argue that the fomenting of turmoil and disorder is the only effective means of stimulating quiescent groups to act Militants also contend, and this has been the situation on the campus at Berkeley, that group violence will bring repressive response from authority And when confrontation brings such violence--official action or reaction, as the gas-spewing helicopter--then the uncommitted elements will see for themselves the true nature of the so-called system.

But militants have yet to prove that violence actually helps achieve their aims In the history of the American labor movement, there is doubt whether pro-labor violence helped the cause or whether anti-labor violence hindered it. Labor leaders themselves doubt the effectiveness of violence No major organization in American history in the labor field has ever advocated violence as a policy And so it is with student violence It did not take student violence, for example, to bring black studies into the curriculum of many of our important colleges and universities today It's abundantly clear that group violence as a tactic of protest does not contribute to a more liberal and humane society, but often produces an opposite result The fears and the resentments created by these tactics have actually strengthened the political power of some of the most destructive elements in American society

The distinguished former Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, John Gardner, has observed, and I quote him, "No society can live in constant and destructive tumult --Those of us who find authoritarianism repugnant have a duty to speak out against all who destroy civil order. The time has come when the full weight of community opinion should be felt by those who break the peace or coerce through mob action."

But if we're to avoid future violence, our institutions of government must be capable of providing political and social justice for all who live under them and of correcting injustice of any group by peaceful and lawful means. Our Constitution does not speak merely of justice or merely of order It embraces both Two of the six purposes set forth in the preamble are "to establish justice" and "to insure domestic tranquility." The First Amendment guarantees the rights of freedom of speech and freedom of press and the right of peaceable assembly and the right to petition the government for redress of grievances. And thus we have the right to justice. We have the right to domestic tranquility, and we have the right to freedom of speech and peaceable assembly and to petition the government for redress of grievances; but there is no right to engage in group violence--least of all on college campuses, which are particularly vulnerable.

This special vulnerability of educational institutions was eloquently expressed not long ago by President Howard Johnson of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, who said, in part, "Of all the institutions in society, the university is the most nearly defenseless. It has to be The University exists so that there may somewhere be a place for the courageous and direct confrontation of ideas The free flow of ideas cannot take place in an atmosphere of physical confrontations. An open mind cannot long exist in the face of force or threat."

Moving to meet the dangerous situation on his own campus, President Johnson obtained a restraining order from the court against those indicating intention to commit violent acts. In effect, he said, since we cannot protect ourselves and still remain a free and open university, we have asked the whole of society to protect us.

Now let me briefly discuss group violence in the context of the San Francisco State College strike of 1968 and '69, because there confrontation and the right to protest moved to group violence.

San Francisco State, as you know, is a publicly supported liberal arts college occupying a ninety-four acre campus in San Francisco. It enrolls about 18,000 students and confers sixty-three types of bachelor degrees, master degree programs, and doctorates in education

At the onset of the disorders, San Francisco State had a liberal administration and prided itself on treating its students like adults, as indeed most of them were The average age of the students there is about twenty-five. At that time the students controlled their own budget, on the order of some $400,000 a year

They determined how much money would go to support athletic programs, newspapers, theatre groups, ghetto tutorial groups, and so on. The college had the free speech movement long before it came to Berkeley, and it has long been a forerunner of educational innovation and student trends. It developed the nation's first experimental college. It was the place where the Third World Liberation Front was organized.

Now why, in a place like this, were there to be scenes of violence then unmatched in the history of American higher education? The campus was the first to be occupied by police on a continous basis over several months. It was only the daily presence of 200 to 600 policemen which kept the college open from the start of the strike on November 6 to the end of the fall semester. By the end of January there had been 731 arrests. More than eighty students were reported injured. Thirty-two police were injured on campus. Eight bombs were planted on campus, and two firebombs were hurled at and into the house of an assistant to the President.

In the limited time I have available tonight, it is impossible to go into extensive detail regarding the complex, underlying causes of the strike, these are dealt with in depth in the report, and suffice it to say the immediate pressure point was the presentation of the ten so-called non-negotiable demands made by the black students. These demands centered mainly on the establishment and control of a Black Studies Department and in the retention of a controversial faculty member. The strike was controlled throughout by the Black Student Union and not by the Students for a Democratic Society. The blacks did not let the S.D.S. participate in their deliberations on strategy or tactics. They welcomed S.D.S. and sympathetic teachers on the picket line, but the strategy was controlled by the black leaders. The strike went along for the first week with little effect on campus classes; and then came the tragic events of November 13, 1968, which resulted in violence and were largely responsible for making the strike effective until the following March.

About 11:30 that morning a cameraman told police that he was photographing two blacks when he was attacked from behind by a third. The cameraman said he was knocked down and kicked in the back and that he thought he could identify his attacker. The police sent two plain clothes men to accompany the camera man to the B.S.U. hut, where a press conference was being held to stimulate further strike action. The plain-clothes men had walkie talkie radio, and they were in contact with Lieutenant Curran, the San Francisco Tac Squad commander, who was located in an apartment across the street. Something happened to the walkie-talkie, and Lieutenant Curran lost radio contact. Thinking the plain-clothes men were in danger, he ordered part of the uniformed Tac Squad into the area; and this was just about the time that classes let out. Seeing the police come on campus, the students felt that they were being attacked, or at least harrassed, and they attacked the police. The Tac Squad then called for reinforcements and fought back. The Tac Squad was surrounded, "lost their cool," and started pursuing students around the campus. Many were clubbed and beaten, and some arrested. The action generated sufficient sympathy to keep the strike going for almost five months.

The authorities were determined that the college would stay open. When Dr. S. I. Hayakawa was appointed as Acting President, he carried out the orders of the Trustees to the letter, and the college did remain open. There were many efforts to mediate the strike, and finally its end was announced by

Dr. Hayakawa in a March 21 news conference

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Administration granted the major demands of the striking students for a minority curriculum and for the admission of more minority students. It also agreed to set up a school of ethnic studies, of which part was to be the Black Studies Department. And I should here say that the Administration, long before the strike began, had been trying to put together a minority curriculum and had been recruiting more minority people. The problem, discussed in extensive detail in the report, was the lack of flexibility and resources of the Administration on the spot. Under the State College system, as you will appreciate--and you're all pros in the field, so I am not going to do more than simply emphasize it--the trustees, acting through the Chancellor in Los Angeles, hold a death-like grip over the administration of each one of those colleges. And indeed a recent president of San Francisco State, Dr.Smith, has said that there shouldn't be a president of a State College because he doesn't have any power at all.

But the San Francisco State story is not over; and indeed, under the surface, very little appears to have been changed. What has been learned from the State experience and the encounters of other areas is that our higher educational institutions need firm, well-publicized plans for dealing swiftly and decisively with the campus disorders and violence. But, I believe deeply that we should all make a fundamental misjudgment if we rely upon restraint as our basic policy for meeting the future. The deep-rooted problems which underlie San Francisco State's crisis and continue to plague many of the country's higher educational institutions remain to be solved.

Among these problems are long-standing social and economic injustices and inequities, and the continued slow pace of so-called establishment in responding to the need for change. The San Francisco report sets forth the reasons for action of the black student leaders and describes some of the ghetto conditions which undoubtedly influenced them.

One of their major objectives was a demand for a relevant educational opportunity; that is, an educational experience that would prepare them for community service. The chairman of the B.S.U., Ben Stewart, said, and I quote him, "We see ourselves being basically servants of the community. That is to say, we go to a college campus, and we learn academic skills; and we see ourselves as returning to the community to enhance the progress of that community, rather than to exploit or misuse it."

And here he put his finger on the problem at least as I see it. In my view, perhaps over-simplified, I would say the problem is this: the economically disadvantaged, the poor, the blacks, the Indians, the Chicanos want, and they require, "a piece of the action." The only way they can get a piece of the action is to get a job in today's complex technological society. They cannot get jobs because they are not trained and therefore don't fit into the so-called "system." This creates the problem. Their peers, today's students, demand education for all. They see the close relationship between the outside world and education, between their community and their community college. At stake is the very quality of life for those excluded from the system. In our society there's just plain less and less room for the untrained.

Now granted that campus turmoil is undoubtedly fostered to some degree by disruptive elements seeking to destroy, not improve, our social and economic system. This factor, especially as it concerns the community colleges, makes the basic task more difficult. But we must somehow distinguish between the unworthy and the worthy and go on towards the key objective of raising the quality and the general availability of higher education.

In this connection I would like to quote from some remarks by Dr. Jack Aldridge, Assistant Dean of Instruction at San Francisco City College. Speaking with particular reference to the disadvantaged college student, Dr. Aldridge said, "Before attempting to design a curriculum, we should be able to describe in behavioral terms the kind of change we hope to bring about in the disadvantaged student. Is the teaching of an employable skill our overriding concern? Do we want him to develop critical thinking ability? Do we want to instill in him a new set of values? Or do we want to make him just as much like the rest of us as we possibly can? Should he have a voice in the curriculum-designing process? Shall we ask him what he thinks would be a desirable change in himself?" And then he said, "The correct answers to these questions will vary from one institution to another, depending upon the circumstance and the long-range image the college has of itself; but they had better be answered correctly."

As Dr. Aldridge noted, the task of meeting this challenge is formidable, but it must be done, because higher education in America is the doorway to the future. But in this time of rapid change our base is too narrow and our pace too slow. With World War II, the Korean War, the Vietnam War, and the accompanying rapid economic, scientific, and technical changes in our society, our colleges have students far different in outlook from those of earlier days--students who are looking critically at the whole educational system, debating its equality and demanding a voice in its operation.

So I believe, as a layman, that a new concept of higher education, a different structure is imperative. In seeking this concept it seems to me that educators and students and the whole community must somehow reach a consensus on the definitions and the goals of higher education. Admission standards, curriculum, administrative practices, and all the rest of our educational apparatus are currently under intensive examination, as you here tonight well know.

The great City University of New York, with its 178,000 students and 10,000 faculty members spread throughout its nine senior colleges, its seven community colleges, and graduate center and medical school, has already gone to open admissions--meaning simply that every graduating senior in New York City's high schools, if he wants, will be guaranteed a place in the community college's freshman class next fall. This concept, of course, is not new in California; but a part of their plan *is* new and that is that remedial and other supporting services must be supplied for students requiring them so that they have some chance of staying in the University.

At this juncture, as a layman considering the new concept, what the new concept of higher education should be, I wish to pose certain questions, which I hope that you members of this conference--administrators, students, and faculty--will be able to answer. Should higher education demand a high school diploma based on adequate high school education, including the ability to read and write; or should the learning potential be recognized and formalism be waived in favor of college tutorial and other remedial work on the theory that it is a rare human being who can be written off at age seventeen and that the best way of determining whether a potential student is capable of college work is to assist him to college and help him to stay there? And thus, should every student in California have an absolute right to attend a community college, and if he is not capable of going from there to a state college, be guaranteed a job? Would such a policy lower academic standards, either bv driving away really talented students or by compelling the faculty to lower its standards to meet the diminished capacity among the students? Who, who is to determine the validity of demands for institutional changes, be they on admissions, curriculum, or other points?

Now, I want to here state parenthetically that I am not necessarily convinced that student power is a cure-all. They had it in the Middle Ages, notably at the University of Bologna and the University of Paris. At Bologna the professors and doctors could not leave the University under penalty of death or even go out of town without permission. They had to swear absolute obedience to the student-elected student rector, who at the behest of the general assembly, passed or changed any rules. The students collected the fees, paid the salaries, and issued the working rules. If a teacher cut a class, he was fined; likewise, if he could not draw five students, if he skipped a chapter, or if he kept on talking after the bell. The student rector was elected, but he could not hold office more than one month, on Aristotle's theory that no one should be entrusted with any but the briefest tenure of office.

Finally, should colleges and universities maintain restrictive admission standards? Could they not be like public libraries, where one could go and pursue his intellectual interests for as long as he wished and then get a degree in his discipline if he amassed the requisite number of credits?

Now I want to emphasize that I do not advocate a cult of mediocrity nor a general leveling process, but I do believe that much more can and must be done by educators and ordinary citizens alike to look deeply into our present educational system, note its advantages and disadvantages, and move as never before to make the system truly relevant and remedial to the causes of unrest in our country.

In the long run our educational institutions will be what all of us want them to be if--and I stress the "if"--we realize the need to react readily to needed changes. I mean that where legitimate requests are presented or where wise administrators anticipate needs for change, the school authority must have the latitude and resources to act promptly. Action, not promises, is required.

Only when these conditions are present shall we have meaningful student-administration communications. Lacking them, we shall have confrontations with the possibility of group violence on an increasing scale.

If we are to do all this, we shall have to adjust our minds to change. And here, perhaps, I am addressing the faculty and administrators because I ask you to join me in taking some comfort, and hopefully some inspiration, in the realization that change is very old. The philosopher Heraclitus, speaking in the fifth century B.C., said, "There's nothing permanent except change."

It is perhaps worth noting that Heraclitus thought that the stuff the world was made of was fire. Dostoevsky thought "taking a new step, uttering a new word, is what people fear most." In a similar vein Eric Hoffer has pointed out that "We can never really be prepared for that which is wholly new; we have to adjust ourselves, and every radical adjustment is a crisis in self-esteem."

We are told that twenty-five percent of all the people who ever lived are alive today. The amount of technical information available doubles every ten years. Throughout the world there are about 100,000 journals published in more than sixty languages, and that number doubles every fifteen years. We are told these things, but we do not always act as if we believe them.

I think we will all agree that a simple observation of all our friends and associates will confirm the fact that even the most educated people today operate on the assumption that society is relatively static. At best they plan by making simple straight-line projections of present trends. The result is unreadiness to meet the future when it arrives; or as one writer has put it, "future shock." Or, as our Lord said to the multitude, "When you see a cloud rising in the west, you say at once, A shower is coming, and so it happens, And when you see the south wind blowing, you say, There will be scorching heat, and it happens. You hypocrites! You know how to interpret the appearance of earth and sky, but why do you not know how to interpret the present time, and why do you not judge for yourselves what is right?"

I think this ancient teaching is wholly relevant today. In this continuing struggle to improve the quality of life for all our people, education through all stages must be in the forefront, and we must judge for ourselves what is right. Community colleges can--and I am confident that they will--play a key role in meeting this challenge. They must avoid "future shock." In this task, however, they must be aided by the whole community.

In closing, I would like to quote the thoughtful words of Dr. Gregory Anrig, of the United States Department of Education: "Student unrest is increasing in frequency, in intensity, and in complexity. We can suppress it and face it another day, or we can seize upon it as an opportunity for educational improvement. It would benefit our youth, our country, and indeed all mankind to choose the latter course." [Prolonged applause.]

Questions and Answers after Mr. Orrick's Speech

Chairman of the session: Mr. Orrick, you have brought much to us from your study and from your observations. We here are community college people, trying to prevent the confrontation and trying to establish the communication. You talked about both of these with reference to San Francisco State College. Would you stay--and he has agreed to--and answer questions that members of the audience may wish to ask you? This microphone is available to any who would like to ask a question.

Speaker from audience: What did the role of Dr. Hayakawa have to do with the solution of the problem, as an individual, at San Francisco State College?

Mr. Orrick: That's a highly pertinent and very difficult question to answer. As I pointed out in my talk, he carried out the instruction of the trustees to the letter. I suppose we all saw him in his tam-o'shanter, pulling out the wires to the sound truck. He became a national figure. But I don't think that--the negotiations were not really carried on with him; and as I also indicated--and just to be sure, I checked before I came down here--nothing much is changed out there. So that's the most I can say on that.

Speaker from audience: Mr. Orrick, this is a three-part question. You spoke of law and order being embraced by what? I put down country, by what though?

Mr. Orrick: I said that the preamble to the Constitution mentions to insure justice and to establish domestic tranquility. Law and order--it embraces both, and then I also adverted to the First Amendment.

Speaker from audience, continuing: Then do you mean by law and order that which Attorney General John Mitchell espouses--isolate the radicals from society?

Mr. Orrick: No.

Same speaker: Very good. [Applause.] When you were talking about the police going on campus up at San Francisco State, you said the reporter said he could identify his assailant. Did he identify him?

Mr. Orrick: He did not. When he got there, he was unable to.

Same speaker: And the third one, which I am kind of skeptical about, what was wrong with the radio?

Mr. Orrick: Nobody knows.

Same speaker: That's what I thought. Thank you.

Another speaker from the audience: I've admired the report which you wrote so much and agreed with so much of what you've said tonight that I have a little reticence even to raise a question about one point. But I want you to clarify one thing for me. You said near the beginning of your talk that group violence is always anarchy. And I raise a question about the meaning of violence and particularly the group violence. You used this term so it would always apply to those who are in the dissent and who are attempting to gain wider avenues of justice, who are protesting against the structures of society. Isn't it true that one of the most pervasive and dangerous and repressive forms of group violence which we have in our society is those structural forms of violence which do psychological, social, and cultural damage to human beings and to communities--those that are built in to the very structure of the establishment. Isn't that group violence also?

Mr. Orrick: Well, on the first question I said, as I recollect, that group violence is the close companion of anarchy. I should have defined my term more. I should have said that what I mean by group violence is two or more people being actually physically violent. I tried to differentiate very closely from group protest, which I indicated is protected by the Constitution and which is absolutely necessary in the society. But when it gets to actual battery, if you will, that's what I meant by group violence.

Speaker in audience: I think the question is whether this subtle type of violence is violence. You know, whether you have to be beating someone over the head to be violent.

Mr. Orrick: Well, I understand it--I think I did understand the question, and I am off on the question of--I think you have to define what you mean. I have no occasion to find that as violence.

Same speaker from audience: Here's what I got from it, that the government of this country is the most violent thing that we have. For one reason, they sit up there in Congress and they pass bills saying that someone can live wherever they want. This puts a false hope in a black person's mind who does not have the money to do this--he says, well, now I can live wherever I want. Then he gets out into life and finds out that he can't. Now is this more violent, say, than hitting somebody on their back?

Mr. Orrick: Well,---

Same Speaker: This gets inside you. This sticks with you all your life.

Mr. Orrick: I understand that, and I read you loud and clear. And we're still just talking about a broader definition. I'm entirely sympathetic with the viewpoint, but I was asking--I was talking about in my speech, which was the question that was asked me, about group violence, and I defined it as hitting you over the head. I realize the other injustices and inequities, and in my lexicon I can define them more accurately than violence.

Same speaker: One other thing. I wonder if I got what you said--that San Francisco State was a liberal college?

Mr. Orrick: A liberal arts college and had a liberal administration.

Same speaker: Now, the liberal administration is what I'd like to hit on. I think it was shown in the Columbia revolts that the liberal whites or the liberal colleges--liberal, this term liberal has lost its effectiveness for the white people, or lost its meaning because the reason the black people at Columbia asked the whites to leave--it was not that they weren't liberal white students. It was just they were'nt ready to move when the man said move. You know, like the blacks held their building, and they walked out. The whites, when the blacks said we're going to do this, the white liberals said, well, let's think about it. They said, No! We've been thinking for 400 years. Go get your own building. So the whites went and got their building. O.K. Now when the police came for the black building, they didn't get it, because the blacks said there's something to do now. When the police came for the white building, they got it; and the whites came out with their hands up; don't hit me, this kind of thing. So the thing that San Francisco State is a liberal, that'd be enough for them to tear it down.

Mr. Orrick: Well, I didn't use it in the philosophic or political sense.

When I said a liberal administration I had reference to administration that permitted, for example, the first experimental college, kids teaching kids; that permitted the students to decide how they're going to spend $400,000, and in what activities; by permitting--I think they were liberal enough recently so that one professor gave every student in his department straight A's. Nobody got less than an A. That's the kind of liberal I meant. I wasn't trying to define it as a Hubert Humphrey liberal or that kind of thing.

Speaker from audience: In your discussion of the disturbances at San Francisco State you mentioned quite often what the B.S.U. was doing as far as being involved in these violent confrontations, and once you mentioned the Third World, but you didn't specifically point out whether the Chicanos had any involvement; and I was just wondering how come you left this out.

Mr. Orrick: They were involved on the picket line, but the B.S.U. was like the previous speaker said at Columbia, they started it, the ten demands originally were theirs; then the Chicanos added the five additional ones, all along the same line, and so they were indeed involved; but the actual strategy of the strike was handled by B.S.U. leaders. They wouldn't let anybody else in.

Speaker from audience: I'd just like you to comment on something that came into my head while you were speaking. You mentioned that group violence is a form of anarchy. Correct?

Mr. Orrick: I said it was a close companion to anarchy.

Same speaker: I'd like you to comment on this. Wouldn't you feel more concerned about anarchy existing in our own governmental institutions, perhaps the police force? and examples of this are numerous. Look at the Hansen murders in Chicago or the Democratic Convention in Chicago. You know this is group violence also, but if you define it as anarchy, then it seems we should be more concerned about anarchy in our government than we should be on our campus.

Mr. Orrick: Good point. I was at Chicago--and chased.

Speaker from audience: The tactics of confrontation are often lumped in with group violence, but at one point you said that confrontation as a tactic was quite valid, and you justified it as a means of communication; and then I think you moved directly into the San Francisco State scene. I'm sure that we need to learn more about the creative use of confrontation and wonder if you have any examples of that style and how that can be an effective tactic for getting a point of view across.

Mr. Orrick: What I said on confrontation was that it is a means of communication, albeit a rather unpleasant means. And I had in mind, when I see five angry guys standing outside my door and I've had some relation with them, I just have to know that they're telling me something, and if it's 100, it gets worse. So as long as they don't swing to violence, I think it's conduct protected by the First Amendment; and I think it is communication. It is harder to write to each other and talk to each other, I'll say that; but I think they're telling you something. I don't have any experience myself in the use of confrontation as a tactic.

Speaker from audience: Do you put any truth at all in the widely circulated belief that some kind of unified, monolithic Communist conspiracy is behind all of the protest and dissension that occured in the last decade?

Mr. Orrick: None at all.

Speaker from audience: Doctor Orrick, in your reference to violence as a means you seem to write it off as never leading to success. Now because we don't espouse violence does not mean it cannot be a successful means, group violence in particular, of achieving certain aims. To say it's not successful is kind of like saying sin does not lead to pleasure. I think if you'll study the period of the abolitionist movement prior to the American Civil War, you will see that those leaders who took the violent tactics and were involved in group violence were the most successful--including Garrison, Phillips, and others. And I think that the problem is, in fact, I think it was the violence at San Francisco State that lead you to writing the speech tonight and to make the proposals that you did for change. Now I hope that there are other means we can use to achieve this, but to say that group violence does not lead to successful change I think is incorrect and naive. [Applause.]

Mr. Orrick: Well, I think you're possibly more learned on this than I. I think in the short run it might be said to achieve, in certain instances, short-run objectives. In the long run, I don't think that it does achieve it; but more than anything, it's dangerous to society, and it will not, it just plain will not, be tolerated. I don't care where it is. Now you can have continous group violence like in the American Revolution. Well, that's what you get into. Then you get into an all-out bloody revolution. But that's my reading of history. In the short run, I think that you are correct in some instances; but in the long run, and looking in particular at the history of the American Labor Movement, where there has been a great deal of group violence, I have been unable to find anyone or indeed read any article or anything in history that ever supported that as a means of achieving their long-range objectives. [Applause.]

Chairman of the session: Mr. Orrick, I am in the easy and happy position of having introduced a man who I said was going to make a major contribution to the deliberations of this conference. Do you [the audience] agree with me? [Applause.]

SIXTH SESSION

A. "The Emerging Role of the Church in the Community College," by Mr. William Hallman, Western Regional Secretary, United Ministries in Higher Education.

The other day I reread an article by Ralph Jordon in the March, 1968, issue of Administration." Now most of you teachers, even if you take that journal, probably didn't read that article because the title itself you probably felt was a contradiction in terms. And while I think the article is well worth your reading, whether you're a teacher, administrator, or student, it's the accompanying letter that Ralph Jordan sent to the editor that I want to share with you this morning. Here's what he said:

> Having left active military service, obtained a job as an administrator in education, and started a program to gain degrees in educational administration and educational psychology, I found myself encountering new and fascinating ideas. Not from the feet-in-concrete-platitude-between-the-ears heroes that go around displaying their courage by knocking down open doors and sneering at navel gazing and the sacronity [sic] of love, but from the young people who will soon, thank God, displace the convention-bound old fuds and from some chronologically old administrators whose continuous dialogue with the bright youth has kept them alert to the revolutionary happenings around us.

He goes on to say,

> The most fascinating of these ideas was that of love. Not the erotic Hollywood drool, of course, or the sex passions of the scandaled press, or the syrupy slop of some professional do-gooders, but the dirty-feet, hairy-chest love that built the might of Christendom out of the dusty villages of the Near East, that in an extreme form may impel some men to win the Medal of Honor, that seems to have a strange and strong motivating force in the Haight Ashbury, and even that our industrialists have recognized, but not our college administrators. They, firmly anchored in the first two or three decades of this century, still fail to recognize their responsibilities for helping our youth fit into the 20th century. For them love is OK. for an hour on Sunday, but not respectable during the rest of the week.

I commend this article to you. The most fascinating of these ideas was love. Now this fascinating idea seems to me to be basic both to the church and to the college, and sometimes both run great risk of having lost it. For somewhere buried in the New Testament is a statement, which I think capitalizes the Hebrew-Christian tradition, for this is a message that you hear from the beginning: that we should love one another. Some of us are realizing, or we're being helped to realize, that learning can only take place in an atmosphere of love.

The worst thing we can do is sentimentalize this simple but basic idea, or enslave it to traditional moralisms. Sadly enough, this is all too often what both the church and our society have done.

Jim Joseph, former chaplain of the Claremont Colleges, was with a group of us in San Francisco in November, sharing some insights from his study and experience with some black theologians, Jim himself being a black theologian. Said Jim, "There has developed a heretical tradition within the Christian Church which assumes that the distribution of love for one's neighbor is based on liking one's neighbor. It assumes that giving, the sharing of resources, is based on the self-serving luxury of charity." But he said, as Rudolph Bultman reminded us a long time ago in his Doctrine of the Creeds, "Love which is based on emotion or sympathy or affection is self-love, for it is a love of preference of choice; and the standard of that preference of choice is the self."

Now what I'm suggesting, therefore, is that serious ethical reflection must avoid the tendency to sentimentalize love, and it must define justice in such a way as to limit our standards of equity by the distinctions made between friend-neighbor and the enemy-neighbor. The essence of moral duty lies in the concept of the universality of the neighbor rather than his particularity. It is in this context that we understand what it means to assist other men in seeking fully human lives.

Now in our ethics sometimes we engage the discussion all wrong. Our task of understanding and interpreting who we are is made especially difficult by moralists who are far too concerned about free love and not enough concerned about free hate. And I was reminded last night, when Dr. Orrick was speaking, about some interviews Charlie McCoy and I had when we were on a committee, also, to do some studies at San Francisco State. One of the most fascinating interviews I remember out of that month-long experience--and we had many fascinating ones--was with the police captain who was in charge of the police detail on that campus. This police captain said that the thing that impressed him was not so much the violence of the students on campus, though that bothered him, but the depth of the hate of the people in that nice neighborhood. We are far too concerned in our nice society about free love, not nearly enough concerned about free hate. We absolutize the law as a final good, and, instead of seeing love as a fulfillment of the law, we consider law the fulfillment of love. So we have law-and-order theologians, as well as law-and-order preachers, who continue to define order as a sacred quality of our human relations.

We are therefore, called to liberate both the concept of love and our concept of justice from our traditional moralisms. And unless we do this, we in the church have very little to offer.

These are some of the things we are learning out of the revolution that is going on today. It seems to me that our task is to transform this basic idea of love, this fascinating idea which Ralph Jordan found when he went back to school, into a substantive response to the youth who are living in the last third of the twentieth century. These are the awakened youth that we have learned to appreciate at this conference, unique in moral sensitivity; and indeed these are the young people who are deeply religious, and yet these are the very youth who have rejected the church.

Dr. John Cantelon of the University of Southern California says,

> Religion in the mind of most students is burdened with two almost fatal characteristics. First, it manifests itself in an institutionalized form of the church that is almost as odious in students' eyes as are the structures of the University. Second, its commitments are so total and traditionally so apolitical as to appear irrelevant and yet, the students certainly have not rejected religion. They are seekers, really.

Paul Goodman, in an article he wrote in the *New York Times* in September, 1969, reminds us that men do not live without systems, systems of meaning or systems of values that everybody puts their hopes in, whether they really believe them or understand them, or not. And he said, in advanced countries, particularly in our Western World, science and technology gradually and triumphantly have become the system of mass fate. Not disputed by varuous political ideologies and nationalisms, they have had their religious uses. And he says this faith is now the thing that is threatened. The dissident young are saying that science is anti-life. It's a Calvinish [*sic*] obsession. It has been the weapon of white people to subjugate colored races, and scientific technology has manifestedly [*sic*] become diabolical. Along with science the young are discrediting the professions in general and the whole notion of disciplines and academic learning. He says that if these various views take hold, it adds up to a crisis in belief, and the effects are incalculable.

Our task, both as educators and as leaders, is to transform this basic idea of love into some substantive response to the oppressed of our society. That vast segment of our culture that has been educationally and socially deprived is now demanding a share in the American higher education scene. Dr. Norvel Smith told us about this yesterday, and this has been coming through the core of our conference here. In a frenzied order, higher education has been setting up special programs. It's engaged in an all-out effort to recruit minority faculty and students; it's building special facilities in an attempt to meet the demands of the blacks and other minority groups. But will the response be substantive enough, or is it just a reaction to some pressures that will have no lasting value? This is what really bothers me as I move around in that vast array of states that I attempt to cover. Because it's happening every place. But will it be substantive enough, and will the kinds of things we've been talking about here really be seen as having a high priority in these academic institutions?

Well, our task, both as educators and as church leaders, is to transform this basic idea of love into a substantive response to the vast multitudes of our society who are living in perpetual fear of change. That describes most of us too, I'm afraid. This is the impatient middle class of our society who are suspicious of higher education and fearful of the awakened youth and the aspiring minority cultures. I'm afraid that their spokesman today is Spiro Agnew; and even Eric Hoffer, in his statement before Senator McClellan's Committee on Campus Disorders, I'm afraid, speaks for too large a group of them when he said, "All the colleges need is tough administrators who will spit on their hands and say, Who do I kill today?" This is the other side of the dilemma.

But how do we make a substantive response to this basic idea of love, to that aspect of our society? Well, the substantive response will have to be found within the context of each situation. I have no easy answers. Maybe I am romantic about the community colleges; but what opportunities I see we have within these institutions! You have said more about this than I can say in this paper. For example, the open-door policy--what opportunities we have if we have courage and imagination enough to really see the full implications of that concept and if we can keep it from becoming a revolving door! What opportunities we have to make that a substantive response! If we take seriously the community college's freedom from the traditional limitations that are placed on the four-year state and private institutions, what opportunities we have for innovation in higher education!

I remember one conference--and it was a community college conference--where Nevitt Sanford said that he thought that the community college was the only place now where we have some hope for innovation in higher education. What opportunities we have! And, as the students have been telling us here at this conference, if the community concept of the community colleges really means anything at all, it challenges the college to use its resources to meet the human needs that exist in the community. What opportunities we have for a substantive response!

Well, the title assigned to me was, "The Emerging Role of the Church in the Community College." What does all this have to say to the church's role? For the most part I have to admit the church has ignored the community college because it has not known what it is nor has it accepted it as a serious phenomenon within higher education. But this situation is changing, and it's changing rather fast. The sheer size of it forces people to notice. But I hope it's changing for more reasons than that. The church is beginning to recognize the community college as a vital part of the higher education scene in America and is opened to explore what its relation should be to the community college. The danger, as I see it, is that the church will respond to the community college with patterns of ministry in higher education which were worked out in an earlier period and for different types of academic institutions. This is the normal way of thinking, but it won't work.

In addition to the concerns the church has for higher education, generally all of higher education, it seems to me there are two compelling reasons for the interest in the community college.

First, if the church is to take seriously this basic idea of love, which is very relevant to the church (sometimes it doesn't know it), then the mission of the church is one of ministry to the world. The God-given mission of the church is one of basic service to mankind. Pope Paul VI reminded us of this in his opening address to the final session of the Vatican Council when he said, "The church is in the world, in this world; it's not an end in itself. She is at the service of all mankind. She must make Christ present to all, to individuals, to persons as widely and as generously as possible." This, he said, is her mission. And the only way the church can fulfill this mission is by working with and supporting other community institutions dedicated to human service. So I think if the church has any integrity in its own mission, it has to take seriously the community college.

The second thing I would like to say is that I see the community college and the local church as basic community institutions; and the potential points of intersection of the community college and the local church in meeting human needs is, I think, very significant.

Therefore, I see the goal of the emerging role of the church and the community college as one that will seek to discover ways by which the church and the community colleges, as basic community institutions, can work together to support each other in an effort to develop the highest human potential within that community.

Now, lest this goal seem too ethereal or might get lost in some of the ocean fog here, I'd like to very quickly suggest some ways that I see this could be manifest.

First, I think one of the basic roles I see the church playing in relation to community college is what I call the role of the advocate-critic. I think this is fundamental if the church is serious. In this period when society is so drastically polarized, or becoming polarized, the integrity of higher education itself is at stake. If the church is seriously interested in higher education, its first concern must be that of maintaining the integrity of the institutions of higher learning themselves. This, of course, implies many things. One, it implies, on the part of the church, trying to understand what the goals and the aims of the community college are. I'm not sure the community college understands these itself, but I think the church has to make some serious attempts in dialogue with the community college to understand. Two, there's got to be a willingness to support and interpret, even when the situations get rough. Three, there's got to be a willingness on the part of the church to criticize when it feels that the aims of the college are confused or if they are less than their highest potential. These certainly could be things that the college might say to the church too. This advocacy may be in local communities, it may be in the state, or it may be national; but it must be one that helps us support the college against social, political, and religious pressures. I think that's very important.

Second, I think church leaders--both lay and clergy, both in and out of the community college--can join together in forming dialogue groups. Now some of you who know me well know that this is something we have been working on for a long time. Small groups of interested people representing the church and the community college coming together to seek to understand each other's goals and needs and who are ready to take a hold of whatever the spin-off is from such dialogue groups to carry out some actions. I don't need to go into detail, because we had a conference in March, 1966, here at Asilomar for two days on this very subject, and some very fascinating dialogue groups were started, and some of them are still in operation. I wrote an article for the Junior College Journal which outlines some of those experiences. Our experience has been that these small dialogue groups can be very valuable in building a relationship between people who are really concerned about the basic human issues that confront the college and the church, and I would recommend them to you.

Third--and this, I suspect, applies to those of us who are hired by the church to carry special responsibilities for higher education, but I hope that we might get some clues from the people who are in the community colleges and other schools--in these times, we need to develop strong programs to assist local congregations. These are at least the constituencies we have, from where I stand, to relate to. We need to have a strong program to assist local congregations to understand the dynamics of what's happening in higher education today, and I think it can't be just preaching or lecturing to these people. We've got to develop ways so that they can encounter the dynamics of higher education if we're going to speak to that large public group that's fearful of change.

My fourth suggestion is that we develop occasions where we can explore together in small regional groups the concerns that are common to church leaders and to community college leaders. I question the value of more and more large conferences, where we have an opportunity to talk at each other. I think we need to create more opportunities for us getting together in smaller regional groups where we can really share with one another our common concerns and help each other grow. I'm thinking of some kinds of consutations or seminars that have been held in southern California the past couple of years, groups where we can explore together some of the new life styles that are emerging today, the various sub-cultures and counter-cultures that are developing; not just to learn about them, but to have dialogue with them; where we can have consultations or seminars on exploring the implication of some new learning processes, and seeking to understand specific needs in our own communities.

My fifth suggestion is where we have ecumenical or regional structures, whether councils of churches or campus ministries, that we develop a way to commission some people in the community, be they clergy or be they faculty, to be the contact person or the agent to represent the religious community in this particular area. And I would propose that the church use whatever limited resources it has to develop a program to support these people rather than trying to hire more specialists on the campuses.

This could come out in many ways. We could be bringing them together for seminars periodically, making it possible for them to participate in national-regional consultations, anything that will give them a broader perspective on their role in higher education and the role of the church and the community college in the community. Such a program would be quite similar, I would think, to the Danforth Associates Program, but it would have much more close responsibility to the local community, which I think is very essential.

The sixth suggestion I have is that the church really manifest its interest by supporting the ecumenical programs that already exist on campus by encouraging their development and showing a willingness to resource [sic] them; but not just the religious programs--maybe especially not just the religious programs--but those student activities and other programs that help make real the concept that education is a total process and not just a classroom exercise. These kinds of things, I think, are very vital on a campus. And we ought to be supportive of them instead of trying to impose some additional programs on to them.

My seventh suggestion has already been pointed out by our first speaker at this conference. There's no limit to what can be taught in the community college; and I would say that the church will manifest its interest by encouraging the community college to teach courses in religion and other courses that deal with meaning and value and be willing to support its right to do so on the same basis that it teaches any other subject. Once you start teaching them, one of the problems that will arise in any community is static from some churches. And I think some of the church leaders have a responsibility to uphold the college as it seeks to live out with integrity its responsibility to deal with religion as an academic pursuit and to deal with questions of value and meaning.

Suggestion number eight is that where the church does have staff in the community college, be it campus minister or chaplain, full time or part time, the basic task of this staff is to assist those in the academic community to do their own tasks. If you will, they are to be there to be resource brokers to assist the church and college to better fulfill its mission.

My ninth suggestion is that the church and the community college, along with other groups, form creative collations [sic] to carry out special community projects to meet special needs. We ought to be ready to join forces, both as church and college, with other community groups who are concerned about the quality of human life in our community and not bother about who gets credit or what kind of labels they carry.

Lastly, I think the community college can be a great resource to the church. Any church that functions as though the community college didn't exist is missing a great bet. I think the college can be a great resource to the church to help the church understand its own educational task much better.

So it seems to me that without violating the integrity of either institution, the church or the community college can develop a strong working relationship on the basis of a common concern, a mutual involvement in some of the basic questions that are confronting us as human beings.

B. "How We See It," by campus ministers of various faiths.

1. Mary Alice Geier, Campus Minister, United Ministries in Higher Education, Los Angeles City College.

It is usually assumed that campus ministry means first of all a ministry to students. We are all in the business of "good news," those of us who professionally represent the churches or those of you who as laymen respond to the Gospel, the Good News. And yet from students I hear a lot about "bad news." "That class is bad news; that teacher is bad news; it's a bad scene."

In our celebration this morning we were experiencing bread as a symbol, and I recall that "to the hungry man, God is bread." What is God, or Good

News, to the students experiencing bad news? Our job is to find some good news for that.

Through the years that I've worked in this capacity--and they're rather long now--one can find many of the same kinds of bad news for students: personal problems; problems of adjusting almost into two cultures. This is especially true for community college students who try to live at home and get along in the same old community. The expectations of their parents often come through as different from the expectations of the school. But in recent years, most of the bad news has to do with their relationship to the school, to the educational process itself.

"Well, have you seen a counselor?" "Yes, but he didn't help me. I went in, but he didn't help me." "Why does my teacher say this about my English paper?" They bring them in! Almost all of the bad news that comes to me, a friendly soul who doesn't dispense grades, has to do with what's happening to him in education itself. It's become very clear to me that the good news that we, from the standpoint of the church's concern, can give to students is to Help improve the whole educational experience. This means getting involved with faculty and decision-makers more than it does putting on programs for students.

This explains why the dialogue process that Bill alluded to has become for me the sum, really, of what we are on the campus to help promote. I mean something very specific when I say "dialogue." I am convinced that few people really talk to each other, and if we can learn how to really talk back and forth with each other, we are taking action of a sort. That action may lead to some other action.

I'm willing to not know what's going to happen when we come together, even in as large a group as this. We start with some basic things we want to do, and then see what happens. Dialogue is not just a fancy new term for discussion or workshop. (I also have some specific definitions in my mind as to what "workshop" means, since my Master's thesis was "A Workshop Method for Leadership Education." It has a specific meaning.) "Dialogue" does too, a meaning which Robert Theobald has helped to delineate. You bring together people who have one kind of responsibility or another, you identify areas of major agreement, areas of major disagreement, and work from that point. I really recommend that you try to develop this kind of thinking process. It does not depend on a professional staff. That's the beauty of the kind of thing that churches and community colleges can do together, whichever one develops the urge for it first.

Perhaps someone at the college says, "I'd really like to talk more with some of the leadership people in the churches, whether they be lay or clergy," and sets up an opportunity. Likewise, clergymen coming to the campus can say, "We'd like to get inside your problems, really understand the community college situation. What are the main concerns of your students--who are also our students, our young adults, whether or not we see them in a congregation?"

This sort of thing can happen and will really influence the decisions of individual teachers and administrators. A lot of by-products come from such an experience, because we all have to get into the business of education today.

Did you notice in the workshop reports how many came out last night saying, essentially, that the purpose of education is to free the individual? Did you notice that? And the surprising lack of any statement saying what education means in terms of responsibility for the common good? But let's say that all of us here really believe with our whole hearts, as I'm sure the students do, that the purpose of education is to free the individual for his highest potential. You don't have agreement on that at any level of education in our society. The parents of your students don't believe that and don't live by that. That's not what they want you as educators to do. Your boards of trustees, I think, do not believe that, and certainly the faculty do not. All you have to do is sit in the faculty dining room for one day; you will not get the impression that they think that's the purpose of education!

Educational philosophy is the bag of both the churchman and the schoolman, and we need to get caught up together in the teaching-learning situation process.

Education is the great selector in American life as to who will make it and who won't. Some people are saying that education has become the new secular religion. Salvation comes through making it in the school system. You can carry the analogy further and have a lot of fun with it. Who are the high priests of the tenured professions, for example? Students really see their schooling this way. I recall a black student saying to me, "Education has become our Messiah." But many high hopes are shattered by the reality of the revolving door, which is another phase of the open-door opportunity that Bill affirmed.

Here, it seems to me, is the contribution that someone has to make for those of us responsible for the whole experience--and I thank the students here for the phrase "total education" and the meaning they were able to help us get into that phrase--. Some people will have to bat this out, and it's hard work. Dialogue is hard work, where you don't worry about your role, and it's not just words. A certain commitment emerges. This is one of the ways in which we can translate the Good News.

For a campus minister a lot of the proclaiming of the Good News has to be in non-verbal ways. One has to translate Good News for Bad News. Most of all, we have to get involved with our own colleagues, who are the faculty, primarily, and the decision-makers. That is the way we're really going to serve the students in the long run. I think we can come and speak about issues, not being critical as outsiders, but critical allies. We are a part--we care so much. This is our institution, too. We care what happens.

On that basis I think we can and must challenge the value systems of the institutions. To give an example, our college decision-makers can ask for more security police, but we can't do anything about getting a social worker for a community of 10,000 people in an inner-city situation where it's very, very obvious we need such help. Some little basic needs, like having a place to store one's belongings after being evicted until getting re-established, require so much red tape to solve, and the college can't do a thing. The difference in value systems shows up here. A board of trustees will immediately respond to a request for more security police; but can you even make them see the need for having one social worker or one psychiatrist available, or some way of just setting up an information center where services already available can be made known and accessible to students?

When you think in such terms, you can find a lot of ways of translating Good News. Through dialogue and through sharing a real concern for the institution I've heard school people saying the theologically-concerned things that the church may see as its particular responsibility. I've heard a college president list as one of the goals of a college "to create a climate of affection." Here we are indeed getting into values. I think our Good News is that there can become a community at a college, that there can be fellowship as a by-product of a common seriousness, and not just as an end in itself.

2. Father Gary Timmons, Chaplain at Humboldt State College and College of the Redwoods.

The campus minister certainly fulfills traditional roles--those of religious services, counseling, liturgy. I think that's still a value, especially in colleges where there is a resident student body whose homes are far away.

I think the campus minister certainly is also a resource person; and here, I feel, is one area where the college and the church need to get together. I think the college needs to do it more than the church really, if they are going to be what they really consider themselves to be, a real educational institution. Because I have a hard time comprehending--and the longer I'm in the college work, I have a harder time comprehending--how an education institution can so often exclude from real academic investigation a whole area of human experience and still consider itself really an educational institution.

The separation of church and state is often interpreted in most campuses to mean, "Don't dare preach anything religious, but go ahead and knock it all you want," which isn't really honest. It shows a lack of integrity, and it also shows a lack of real dedication to what education is all about. Exposing the student to the whole gamut of human experience, to learn just for himself in a true give-and-take, take-it-for-what-it's-worth-in-comparison-to-something-else situation. I think the college really needs this; and I think the campus minister as a resource person is often neglected.

I get this feedback from students all the time: A professor will spend his whole course seemingly venting his own religious hang-ups on the student, who doesn't have the experience to react nor the sophistication to stand up to the sarcasm of the professor, but at the same time the professor will refuse, even upon request of the student, to invite into the classroom an expert in this subject that he is taking apart, which oftentimes is religion or the church in the Middle Ages, or whatever it happens to be. I think, again, integrity and a true educational experience demand that resource people--not just in church and religious institutions--be given opportunity to provide the other side of the question where the professors themselves are hostile or fearful, where seminars can be set up where men from different disciplines take up the same topic, are able to present their own view, and allow the students to hear men defending themselves against their peers, not a man standing behind a pulpit or lecturn, pronouncing the dogmas of his own particular hang-ups while not allowing the other sides to be heard and the student not able to react. I really feel this very strongly. I think very few educational facilities really offer total education in this sense.

At Humboldt State we're starting this quarter, a tremendous experiment of organizing a seminar series in which ten professors, including the campus minister, chosen from a wide variety of disciplines and philosophical backgrounds, will take up the questions that the students really want taken up: not how chromosomes react, not how trees grow, or how fish reproduce, but the questions of life and suffering and death and love and personal relationships--things that really aren't brought up in the normal academic situation. The psychologist takes man basically as a mind, the P.E. teacher takes him as a body; but the total man is seldom brought up for academic investigation. In these seminars we hope to be able to take topics, the first one being the Nature of Man. What is the nature of man? And in these seminars the professors will be speaking not as experts, but from the standpoint of "this is what I believe," "this is where I am"; and they will be challenged and will have interaction with their peers, the students listening to this interaction; and then every third week there'll be no topic and students will have the opportunity to make their own statements. I think this is more to what we're really aiming at if we're really interested in education rather than the safe system of feed-them-what-I-believe, make-them-parrot-it-back-whether-they-believe-it-or-not, whether-they'll-forget-it-in-two-weeks-or-not. This is pretty safe. So I think this is one area the campus minister can easily fulfill.

I think he can also serve the administration as an adviser. I think he can serve validly on campus committees--student personnel, values committee; and of course, if these things are set up, they should operate and function and even meet occasionally. Otherwise, they don't really serve too much value.

I think the campus minister has a unique position on the campus. He's in the institution, and yet not part of it as such. He has access to all three distinct levels of the school--the administration, the faculty, and the students. He has no bones to pick as such. He has nothing to fear in the sense of employment or grades. I think the campus minister can really be a conscience on the campus and an interpreter of one level of the campus to another and of the community in which the college exists, to the college, and vice-versa.

This was very true in our area in the moratorium. We have a very conservative area in the North, and the moratorium was a very strong movement, even on the conservative campuses. And to interpret what was going on in the students' minds to the people in the town was a major role of the campus ministry; to prevent ugly things happening where nothing ugly was needed; a matter of communication; being interpreter.

I think, as I said at the beginning, the college needs very particularly to get back to the idea again of total education in the sense of the total man; taking up the total man, and not man in departments, not man by disciplines, but a situation where the total man and the questions that a total man asks are able to be taken up in true academic fashion, the real questions of life, not the artificial, safe ones.

The students, I feel, have very definite religious needs and questions today. I think they consider themselves not religious, because they reject so much the traditional concept of religion, where in reality, a lot of the things that they're asking and seeking and experiencing are truly religious. And I think again that the college that attempts to ignore a whole area of human experience and a whole area of the dynamism on which our culture is built ignores a vital part of education.

I don't see how architecture, for example, can be studied without the concept of religion and the role that it plays, or any form of the fine arts. Any kind of concept of history, without a concept of religion, somehow seems to be really sterile and only half real.

I think we have to accept one basic thing as reality--that the opposite of love isn't hate, it's indifference. And I think that is what we find on so many of the college campuses, not just in the role of the college to the church, but oftentimes vice versa. But indifference is really the opposite of love; hate isn't. And there is on a lot of college campuses, I feel, sadly enough, a great deal of fear of and oftentimes hostility toward, not only of the church and the role of the church, but of the faculty against the administration, the students against the faculty--these kinds of relationships.

And one last shot which doesn't have anything to do with anything I have said before. I got this from listening to the conference, especially yesterday. I think we confuse the student revolts because I think there are two revolts going on, and I think they are going to become more complicated as things go on. We have, I think, the middle-class white students revolting against the standards, the values, the structures which exist today. This would be called the hippy element, I would guess, in one way. They want something else. They've achieved the Great American Dream in one way or another, and they find it lacking. On the other hand, we have the minority students who are striving to accomplish what the middle-class students are rejecting. I think there are two movements going on--the one trying to accomplish what the other has already left. And I think the problem is going to be multiplied as we go on in this process, unless we somehow are able to take a short cut to bring them together.

I offer this for whatever it's worth. [Applause.]

3. The Reverend Barry F. Cavaghan, Campus Minister, Sacramento State College and Sacramento Community Colleges.

I just want to heighten and flesh out a few things that have been said so far.

The first, I think, is that you who are teachers, administrators, students, must see the church in two ways. First, you see it institutionally. Second, however, you see it as a sort of invisible conglomeration of people who are at various levels of self-consciousness or unself-consciousness but who somehow have some push, some tendency towards service in the world. These people often find themselves no longer identifying themselves with other admitted Christians on the basis of theology or their faith stance. Rather they are seeking the allies and resources by which they can "pull off" a more human world.

It's out of that context in which I speak, because the professional campus minister is one man who by himself can often be a very creative and free agent and yet, without that consciousness of all those invisible allies around the campus, can do very little.

Now I would like to point out three examples of how a campus ministry can work. One example demonstrates the kind of flexibility and dynamism that's good news for you. At one of our community colleges in the Sacramento area, a self-consciously Christian student group raised the question of how it could serve the campus and saw that there was a great need for what at that time we would call a coffee house experience. But the administration didn't want to touch it. After going through all the routes we finally found a local church willing to put the coffee house in their upstairs "cry room"; so they ripped out the nursery for the babies, and they put in the college students. That coffee house has taken over the church! The coffee house with these dynamic college students and faculty and other allies in the community see themselves as a community service center. And this all started because a small group of self-conscious Christians on the campus were trying to find some way of serving the campus.

The flexibility, the dynamism is what I'm trying to suggest. Though it's very true that the church as an institution has a fantastic number of hang-ups and blocks, it is still, in some ways, one of the freest institutions left in our society; and I hope you will see it that way, rather than as a collection of unimaginative fuddy-duddies, simply hung up in different places.

The campus ministry's style is to try to find the dynamic edge. That's one reason it's often been identified as the friends of the left rather than the right; because the left is where often the direction of the future is. But we campus ministers, as clergymen, have often been tarred unfairly with the brush of being solely supporters of the left. As we analyze the time we spend with people, it's mostly with people who are in what we would call the broad middle spectrum.

This brings me to the next example that illustrates a style and mode of ministry. In the older days that Bill Hallman talked about we could import the model of the pastor who tends his flock, often trying to save them from the "godless college." Such an approach is impossible today. In Sacramento there are well over 20,000 community college students on three campuses, most of whom commute. What does it mean to be a pastor to 20,000 students, to say nothing of the faculty? By sheer weight of numbers we are driven inescapably and hopefully to structural approaches to ministry. One example of a structural ministry is to help the college visualize the way it can assist an allied institution like the church. Many of the students who are on the campus have come from local churches, and I do mean it exactly that way. The only reason some are still going to church, in the institutional sense, is because they don't want to hassle their parents. If they have got the guts, "cutting out" on the church is the first place where they typically say no to their parents. Nevertheless, I notice among the campus radicals and many articulate people who are reacting against their heritage, including the church--I notice among them a deep well-spring of idealism, which, when we trace it back, has often been communicated to them at an early age through their parents and through the institution of the church. Whether you like it or not, the Church is still the scene of the crime for many of these people who have turned off the Church.

Now, from that perspective we realize that the quality of students you're getting on campus can be enhanced if we can get to the local church earlier than we do, instead of waiting until the horse has left to lock the door.

In practical terms that means for us in Sacramento that we have developed extensively ministers' continuing-education courses. One of the educational problems of the church's ministry to college personnel is that ministers went through their training about relating the Good News to the world from seminary professors who got their education about the world often twenty years before from professors in secular institutions who themselves were about twenty-five years behind the times! I don't think I am being unnecessarily and unrealistically harsh, as we have checked it out; so we've got this fantastic cultural lag to which ministers are subject. Consequently, what we've tried to do in our ministers' continuing-education courses is to custom-design curriculums, using junior college faculty, that will help these ministers to leap over their anachronistic training and hear the kinds of thought forms and assumptions which are the common knowledge and experience with which the college students are wrestling.

Unconsciously and consciously the clergy inject these new forms into their sermons and teaching and so forth. That kind of updating is a very significant form of indirect service to your college people through an institutional ally, the church. All it takes is to discover one turned-on clergyman in the area who can invite other clergymen to a program of corporate study that has been custom-designed with some resource faculty person at your community college, perhaps for six or eight sessions; a small, free university class, if you will, done for clergymen. That can have enormous ripple-out effects, which is what we have to look for when we no longer can be the direct hero, saving individual college students and faculty. That is an example of the resource-broker phrase that was used earlier.

Now, one other way a new campus ministry form can work. We used to hold "Sunday School" classes on campus on Tuesdays and Wednesdays and so forth, where for an hour a week contract [sic] groups would meet for small study sessions. We found this arrangement almost totally ineffective and useless. As an alternative, in a rather vital attempt to help young college students find adult ways to deal with their lives, we developed the week-ender, which starts on a Friday night and ends on a Sunday afternoon. During that time of intensive effort--some fourty-four hours, very little sleep, study seminars, lectures, art forms, and many kinds of methodologies used--we can often do more to help a student make his life decisions than we could with a year of the Sunday School business on campus!

Now, I bring that example up for two reasons. The first is to encourage faculty to see the possibilities of using intensive time blocks for their own students rather than simply to have this one hour, you know, Monday, Wednesday, Friday--I think that that style of education is just getting more and more unproductive for many. We're finding intensive longer time blocks very, very useful and would encourage you in this respect.

The second reason is to point out that college students are becoming more and more culturally illiterate. At our last week-end Stance Times course we found only five students who had ever heard of the Good Samaritan story--five out of about twenty or so! Now I maintain, and I think many here would agree, that a working knowledge of the Bible is an essential part of the cultural heritage; and the churches obviously didn't do the job with these students. It seems to me that this is simply part of the general secular, educational treasury that we just have to expect from the community colleges and the State colleges. So I'm just laying that one on you.

Now if you don't have the faculty who can pick up this task, there are sometimes some very, very fine, well-educated clergy who themselves are good in educational methodology; and if you can find them, use them. This has been very helpful in the Sacramento area. If you can't, you're up a creek, unless you can find your own instructors. But I'm laying that one on you as a very, very serious responsibility of your community colleges. We have talked about black studies and the need for us to rediscover our heritage in specialized forms. I suggest now that a proper role of the community colleges is to pick up the theological Judeo-Christian heritage, because it's sure not happening in the churches that much.

We have structured this report so that we are primarily giving to you our answers rather than being open and receiving. I think the medium, in that sense, was a poor message to you and I apologize to you in behalf of all of us. But I hope you will, in the moments that remain to us in this coffee break, take us aside, and tell us where you think it is, because it's truly in listening that we find each other. [Applause.]

C. "The Present and Future Role of Junior Colleges in the Realm of Emergent Values--Identification, Transmission, Creation, by Dr. Timothy Fetler, Philosophy instructor, Santa Barbara City College; Mr. Donald Buck, history instructor, Foothill College; Dr. H. Lynn Sheller, President Emeritus, Fullerton Junior College; and Dr. Gale W. Engle, philosophy instructor, Foothill College.

Mr. Engle, Chairman: We propose to conduct this final session very informally. We have a brief presentation by one or two of the group, and hope that you will respond and feel like interrupting as frequently as you feel necessary.

My own comments will be very limited. The morality of reason is the code with which I would like to operate in a search for values.

Last Friday night I was talking with a professor from a university in Illinois. I said to him, "Dr. So and So, do you think it's possible to teach values?" And he replied "Of course, One teaches values willy-nilly." He referred to many of the experiences in his lifetime, during which a number of individuals had been affected or infected with values in such manner that they made careers of their lives that were quite admirable. On the other hand we might turn to Socrates in his dialogue "Meno," wherein he and Meno discuss the possibility of virtue being knowledge. The answer was never given, but it was certainly assumed. So the teachability of values is one in which you may or may not have any confidence, at least in the programmed sense.

One of the things that struck me prior to our coming here today was a view taken by Abraham Maslow, with whom many of you are familiar, whose view is that the ultimate value--and he interchanges needs and values--the ultimate value is the fulfillment of the individual, the actualized individual, the free individual, the person who chooses the better, the healthy individual. I'm not bothering to take the time to analyze the concepts related to those descriptions. But let's suppose that that's where we start; not the unhealthy, the neurotic individual, although many of us may fit into that class, but rather the healthy individual and the things he desires. The things that please him might rightfully be said to be on the way toward the ultimate value of self-actualization.

Now, I turn to Dr. Sheller who will talk to you about priorities.

Dr. Sheller: I have been pleased with the earnestness of the people attending this conference and particularly with the earnestness of the younger people, a phenomenon that's not peculiar to this conference but that I find on college campuses elsewhere, too. I think this is a very healthy sign. I like their impatience with some of the values that we have held, particularly the materialistic values, the obsession with things and status that has characterized our society. I am pleased with this, and I want to devote a little time to talking about the theme of the conference, which is "Priorities for the 70's."

I don't know that anybody at this conference has really tried to arrange our priorities for the 70's--one, two, three, four, five; and if anyone did I don't know that we would accept or could realize them. But it is worthwhile, I think, to do a little thinking on that point. The first priority is life. If you don't have that, there's nothing else; and I am immensely pleased that people are waking up to this priority, and that it's being recognized even in political circles as a priority of the 70's. I am pleased to see on college campuses student movements, student groups, that are organizing to make the public aware of some of the problems of human survival, of the problems of air, soil, water, natural resources. This is a priority.

Population control is another, is one of the conditions of human survival and so another priority for the 70's.

A third priority, also related to survival, is international understanding, cooperation, and justice. If we don't learn to get along in the decreasing size of this world, we are simply going to obliterate ourselves. There are many ways of exterminating ourselves. I guess somebody said you can either do it by fire or ice. I think that we've got to develop during the 70's support for international order; for the United Nations; for the forces that are demanding political, economic, and social reform; and for the common people of the underdeveloped countries of the Western Hemisphere and Africa. We find, of course, the exploitation of these people in other countries by selfish interests in their own land as well as by people outside; and we've found ourselves often supporting the forces of the status quo. And this is another thing that I think we've got to be working on in the 70's. It is a priority if we are not going to have the lid blow off everything.

We've talked a good deal in this conference about the elimination of racial discrimination, racial inequalities; and I think that certainly is a priority for the 70's. We are working on it, thank goodness, and, I think, making progress.

A tremendous priority is that of adjusting our economic system to the social needs of our times and to the technological revolution that has occurred. We've got to find ways of distributing wealth and of adjusting our system to the new technological realities. What are we going to do about technological unemployment and the lack of human dignity that goes along with not being needed in society, not having any purpose in society?

Another priority very closely related to this is the extension of the sense of dignity and self-respect and personal worth to all strata of society, politically, economically, and socially.

I might digress just a moment here. I know this is a small thing, but I have heard a number of condescending comments here and elsewhere about competitive athletics these days. They are in disrepute. I think we need to recognize that here is a place where many people find an opportunity to achieve personal dignity and worth and success. Competitive athletics have a tremendous value to an important segment of our population, and we ought to look back to the effect that sports have had on, say, the English nation from a thousand years back. But this is a small thing here that I just mention in connection with human dignity and self-respect and personal worth.

We've got to have a re-examination of our moral and spiritual values or standards during the 70's. This is not something that occurs once, but it occurs continuously for every person in every generation. It should, at least. I don't think you can just look at this thing once and settle it for yourself. Much less can a generation do it. We have all got to be working on this all the time.

Then there is the philosophical and religious priority of reestablishing a sense of intrinsic personal worth, perhaps on a cosmic level. Is man alone in this universe, and is there a meaning to existence? I don't know that you're going to be able to find an easy answer to that qeustion; but we've got to ask it of ourselves, and we've got to find out whether life can be meaningful and joyful and worthwhile. In one of his novels Hardy writes about the early times of Greece when everybody could be joyful--this may have been an illusion of his, and it's an illusion, perhaps, of modern man that there was a time when everybody was joyful and carefree. I doubt that there ever was such a time. But anyhow the Vale of Tempe is what he refers to there, and he says that now we are coming into a time when the typical picture of man is one of seriousness, of soberness, of more than thoughtfulness, perhaps, of despair; a time when people don't know how to smile or be joyful any more. I think of a little thing that occurred in our home just recently. We were having some joke about something at the table, when a telephone call came, and somebody handed me the telephone. I was laughing at the time so that I couldn't talk, really, and this went over the telephone. I think I must have laughed almost uncontrollably for five or ten seconds, and when I was finally able to talk, the man at the other end of the line said, "It's wonderful to hear somebody laugh." And I think here in the '70's, in a time when there's so much seriousness, when we are sitting under the sword of Damocles, when there is so much pessimism and cynicism, we need to discover how life can be meaningful and joyful and zestful.

Related to all this is the priority of renovating of our educational system for the '70's. There's a word that people are resisting, and that's the word relevant; but I think it's a good word, and I subscribe to it, even if it's overworked. In my view education has got to be made relevant or, at least, its relevance to the everyday needs of students has to be constantly shown to students. We hear all the time from students, This doesn't apply to me. What's this to me? What are Thales and Anaxagoras and Heraclitus to me? Well, the philosophy teacher better be able to tell, and the teacher had better be able to say what is the significance. He needs to do this again and again. I used to think when I was teaching literature that it was an insult to the student's intelligence to say, Now this is what I think the author meant. This is what I think is the theme of this novel or this play or whatever it was. Of course I felt the students should attempt to discover this for themselves; but I found that students are less sophisticated about finding these things out than we sometimes think. We need to be explicit without being dogmatic. And I think we need to show the relevance of our courses. We cannot assume that the relevance is apparent and that the students will just grasp it automatically.

This renovation of our educational system has to do with, has to affect curriculum so that it comes to bear upon these other things that I've been talking about. I don't mean to say that there is no such relevance at the present time, that the curriculum doesn't bear on these things; but it needs to be made more relevant, and its relevance needs to be emphasized more. History and facts and so forth are incidental to the solution of the problems and to the understanding of life and to the living of a full life. I would never try to minimize the importance of factual knowledge, but to me knowledge doesn't exist merely for its own sake.

Well, these are some of the things that I would mention among our priorities, and I think that it's incumbent upon the educational system to help students recognize them, to encourage them to work for them, personally, politically, and in whatever effective, legal way they can.

Person in audience: Dr Sheller, might I ask you a question? I'm a teacher. You're the President Emeritus of a college. I can't help but agree with your priorities, and I suspect that probably all of us here gathered together would agree with your priorities; and yet some of the terms are very high sounding. I'm the guy on the firing line in the classroom, and what the hell does this all mean to me? How is all this to come about? Now admittedly we're making--many of us I think--we're making great strides with the educationally disadvantaged; so perhaps we can leave that aside for the moment. But what of all the other priorities that you speak of? Exactly how can those priorities be achieved? When you talk about the renovation of the educational system, you talk about the renovation of the curriculum. What does this really mean? Are you really talking about a radical reassessment of education, about a radical reallocation of resources, or is this again just the old rhetoric?

Dr. Sheller: Well, when it comes to the renovation of the educational system I think for one thing of a different approach to teaching. Now we have traditionally assumed that everybody is of about equal readiness to begin a course that he's enrolled in and about equally able to move along with the group. But we know that people are not equally ready and not equally able to move at the same speed. The lock-step type of education is not in conformity with the facts of life, and we need to develop a system wherein students can begin where they are and progress at their own speed. That may involve technological changes. The tutorial system is one thing that fits into this, and it's gaining acceptance, and it's very effective.

I believe that students need to be encouraged to insist upon changes too. They should insist upon their instructors' explaining, or making their courses relevant. They should insist upon changes that are necessary. I don't feel that I can say here exactly what they should be; I mentioned the tutorial system as one very good example, though really I don't think that came out of student insistence. That really began with professional experimentation.

Person in audience: May I ask you a question, Dr. Sheller? Yesterday morning--I'm not sure I'm making the proper connection here--but Dr.Freedman spoke yesterday morning about the still-existing "rah-rah" experience with sports in the Southwest and in the deep South and how this exhibits certain values, with the gals dancing on the field with mini skirts and the color guard, etc. And you mentioned minutes ago that you thought a reassessment--and I assume this is part of the renovation of education--a reassessment should be made of the importance of muscular or physical contact sports, which are commonly called competitive sports. Can a case be made for this, actually, in the contemporary college? I know a lot of students who take an extremely dim view of muscular sports; I don't agree with them at all, but I must say I have a difficult time persuading them otherwise. How are you going to do it?

Dr. Sheller: Fine, let them take that point of view; but let them not insist that others take the same point of view. If you think for a moment about the leisure that is coming upon us right now, I think you will be glad for the tremendous public interest that there is in professional sports. Personally I don't really get too excited about professional sports, but I am glad that people have something to be interested in at the moment if they are not able to be interested at a higher level. Really, professional sports are a great boon to this country.

Mr. Engle: Is there anyone in the audience who would like to comment either on this or on any other point that Doctor Sheller has made?

Person in audience: I was going to say you have to differentiate, too, between spectator and participant; and I think you were making a point of participation.

Dr. Sheller: I'm for both.

Mr. Engle: Any other comments on this? Doctor Freedman, please.

Dr. Freedman: I'd like to make this point about team sports and the competitivness of most situations on college campuses. A team is likely to be the one place where a person has the opportunity to be part of some unit larger than himself. I think frequently team sports have a great value.

Dr. Engle: I find that the students I know who have hang-ups about sports are definitely at odds with that very point. They don't want the physical contact, whether out of some sort of homosexual revulsion, or some sort of notion that physical activity lacks dignity. You know, it's messy, all that sort of thing.

Person in audience: I think competitive sports in college are fine. I think they give people who want to make a name for themselves or who want to be together with some other people interested in doing the same thing an opportunity to do this. This can be occasionally. On the other side of the picture too often the schools pay so much attention to the athletic program that attention is drawn away from the necessary parts of the academic program. I know for a fact that in several colleges it is easy, even after registration deadline is closed, for an athlete to get in and get all the classes he wants, when an honor student can't get in. I don't think that's right.

Dr. Sheller: I agree with you fully.

Person in audience: I have a question for anybody here. I have heard every speaker say that you need to recognize the students; I have heard that students are very capable of adding to the college and the community;

and yet when I talk to students, my fellow students, I find that every step that they have tried to take has been resisted to the very last line up. Now why?

Mr. Engle: I don't have the answer to that one. Do you want to speak to that?

Person in audience: Yeah, I'll speak to him. I'll put my neck on the line in the form of self-critisism. Probably one of the greatest obstacles that you are confronting is the faculty itself. Last year I sat on our executive council, and I was chairman of the high-sounding committee which had to do with the improvement of instruction in our college. Lo and behold, my experience after one year was that some of the most conservative, fearing element in the whole college turned out to be the faculty, who came up with all sorts of amazing rational explanations of how things should be tabled and could actually not be done. And I think the same thing is going on again this year; and it's creating increasing frustration among the students, the small number of them that really want to bring about some changes. This is something I don't know how to confront, and yet I do know that on every campus there is certainly, if not a majority, certainly a sizable number of faculty, who would like to work with students to initiate these changes. Exactly how that kind of combination can be put together is what I think we are confronted with, at least one denomination of it.

Person in audience: Don't you know that anyone who has to do with academics in the sense of overhauling or revamping or whatever, is in for trouble? In Sacramento recently a recommendation was made to drop all D and F grades. If a person simply didn't make it, didn't pass the course, then he took the course again, but he didn't get negative grade points in that sense of D's and F's. The point was made by the Dean of Admission to the college that twenty years after, a D or F grade on an academic record still haunts you. And in public prison, you know, you can get a parole after X number of years, but in academics, you never get paroled from that. I am wondering what kind of response there is to that kind of thing in education today.

Mr. Engle: I'd say the leading college of the country, Foothill [Engle is from Foothill!], is already doing a lot of this.

Dr. Sheller: Other colleges are moving in this direction, too. The pass-fail, rather the credit-no-credit method of marking is getting wide acceptance now.

Dr. Briggs: I would like to say I have just made a survey on that for our own college this winter quarter. The answer is over half of the junior colleges of California. This credit-no-credit or this A B C-only technique is pretty widespread.

Person in audience: This is just to re-emphasize what a student back there said. I don't think students are against the contact sport per se. They're against the overemphasis. You've got to get into this sport. You've got to go, go, go. Parents are now doing it down in little league. "Come on Johnny, get out there and hit a home run for us, because we are counting on you."

This is what we are against. And, second, the students' idea, which is normally the athletic students, that it's fairies, they're faggots, they're homos that don't want this contact sport--who's out there battling with the police? These faggots, these fairies, these homos [laughter], and there is more contact there than on the football field.

Person in audience: In response to the question, why is everybody so willing to stand here and say we must listen to the students and it's the students who have been getting things done, I know that the faculty around school even have that problem, from what I gathered. Take audio-tutorial programs and all kinds of other things; before they can approve it, they have to know if it's going to be profitable. Is it going to educate the most students for the least amount of money? Which is, unfortunately, a necessary thing to consider when you are being backed by the community almost entirely.

Person in audience: Yes, I think throughout the weekend here I have seen a gap. The students are what you might call the people that are expected to identify with the system--the instructors, the administrators. For a minute I'd like you to put yourself in the shoes of the student, and you can see the turmoil. The student goes to college, and his eyes are opened. He sees himself being drafted and sent overseas fighting a war he doesn't know anything about, which this system has involved itself in. He finds himself out there in the field, he's the one that is going hungry, he is the one that's getting hurt, he is the one that's getting killed. He goes home, he looks out; he sees the racial problem. He identifies with the system. The system is in control. He goes out and he sees people in his own community going hungry and even starving in some areas, and yet they are spending sixty percent of the budget going to the moon or for defense. They identify with these things they're learning and they're discontent. They're violently discontent; and then it comes to something like this, which is a value conference concerning junior college. Junior college is for students. The students are concerned; but we come here, we hear some very formal, very good speeches, we hear a lot of talk but no action. What can be expected? Well, let's get down to the nitty-gritty. If students is where it's at, where have we talked about the students, what their needs and desires are? If we look on campus, what are the students doing? They see the seething mess the world is in, and so they do one of two things; they either react, or they hide themselves in their booze, their sex, their drugs, and we hear about it; but yet we close our eyes to it, instead of being willing to help. Why is it? We talk about spiritual! I'll just list a few things that we talked about: there is a need for international cooperation, there's a need for social reform; there's exploitation, and there's the racial problem. But if we get down to the nitty-gritty, it's the kids who are going to the weekend parties, or going to pot, or taking their LSD; who are taking drugs; who are having their sex orgies--and it's there, whether you want to see it or not. Are we dealing with these? These are the problems. This is reality. That's where it's at.

Mr. Engle: These are symptoms. Wouldn't you say they are really the symptoms of problems?

Same person: Well, I think they need to be taken up.

Mr. Engle: No, I won't deny that at all, most people here are cognizant of that particular problem; and had we time to explore that, some of the sorts of things that Don Buck and I have talked about in particular, they are directly on that very question, and we couldn't possibly exhaust it. I'm afraid there isn't time to pursue that too far, and I quite agree with you. I am sure most people do. That we can't do much about these great huge tasks. What we have to do, if we do anything, is to start somewhere in the smallest sort of way wherever we are. It's this monolithic look at life that always frustrates us, and we don't see the one thing or the little thing that we could, in fact, do. And that may mean only talking with one other person, or sharing with one other person, or having something to say about curriculum, or something to do about changes in the way a class is conducted. We can't change everything all in a day and to take the approach of "that's the system and let's destroy it" won't get us anywhere except into Fascism.

Person in audience: But I see this conference as a system too, because we have come up here. You have brought students up here and you have brought teachers up here. The students yesterday brought up, I think, valid things to be worked on. I'm going to leave the conference saying nothing has been accomplished. I'm going to leave this conference saying this is why we want to burn this down. I am going to leave this conference saying that I think the teachers are possibly afraid of the students. They have some kind of fear, some kind of--they don't want the students to jump up and say things because they are going to hold them off.

Mr. Engle: Have you had that feeling here, really? I haven't.

Same person: Yes, because just like yesterday. O.K., we had something we could work on possibly for the first time for many people in this room; yet what did we do? We went back to the system, back to the structure that this conference has to have a speaker and people sitting out listening to that speaker; questions and answers; dinner; and then go to bed.

Another person, a college trustee: I think there's a lot more that's happened than shows, because some of us as trustees have changed our minds about certain things these last three days. Some of the college presidents here have changed their minds. They haven't written a paper, they haven't gotten up and made a speech; but their attitudes have been changed. The same thing has happened to students, instructors. These things are something you can't measure--maybe in two days, two years, twenty years, who knows? But things have happened.

Mr. Engle: What was just said a moment ago by the gentleman who is going home without any sense of accomplishment, prompts me to turn to our other member of the panel, Timothy Fetler, who would like to speak to that question. What has been accomplished by this conference Dr. Fetler?

Dr. Timothy Fetler: Well, I have a strong sense of futility at this point, of ambivalence, too, that deals directly with what you said there because I have attended these conferences for twelve years now, and as a philosopher I ask myself, What are we really doing? This, in the main: to clarify the essence of what is involved, not to just suppose things. I would say that there is some secondary benefit from what comes out of this, but it's entirely possible that one of the key purposes that could be accomplished is completely missed, maybe, due to the fact that the value issues are very complicated. And, secondly, it may be that we don't really ask the very fundamental questions that are relevant to the complete situation. To start out with, I, for example, know that in ten minutes or so, I cannot add much to solving the problems of the world, or humanity. I would limit my questions first to one value. What is the value of a values conference? And in doing that, I have experienced certain things in my own personal being which I have tried to pinpoint. I don't think I can see anything meaningful or practical without careful analysis. This does take some time. It does get involved. You see, at my own college I have a strong feeling that the men of action don't take these conferences too seriously. They are good, harmless, activities. You go back, you see, as you are saying, like that. On the other hand, I do feel that there is a way in which specialized value fields have grown, and there are certain methods which can be used as starting points in structuring these activities, what we are doing here, which can be productive. I had made an analysis of this and summarized it and all this, but at this late point in the conference, I think we just have to fade out somewhat without going into all of this. This would start a complete new approach.

Person in audience: We did not fade out today; we faded out last night.

Dr. Fetler: Maybe two days or three days ago.

Same person in audience: You stay up later than that, looking at T.V. at home---

Dr. Fetler: All right.

Same person in audience: ---and there is no party around here; there's not that much to do.

Dr. Fetler: Let me just say one more thing. I think there's a general principle--in any activity there occurs kind of a natural, easy polarization. On the one hand the general approach is to start listing, pooling what we feel about values. So either we have one group which gives us the big ideals of mankind, that is, the dignity of man, freedom, all this, and they are just elaborating the obvious and they don't produce much change except affirming ideals. Then you have the other polarity which concentrates on practical, immediate, concrete situations as you students do, and so on; and this is fine if it's workable, but it still doesn't meet, I think the thrust of what the value--these kinds of values conferences primarily have been aiming for, that is raising the more fundamental question of what is happening to man in general, to our education in general, dehumanization, the meaning of our culture and all of this. Now, to do that, thoroughly, requires a much deeper involvement with the underlying assumptions, the underlying principles, though I say that what you're doing probably is more practical; your general approach.

Person in audience: Doesn't dealing with man and dehumanization and all this, doesn't that deal with what he does mainly?

Dr. Fetler: Yes, but you deal there with both, not only the immediate concrete, like instituting this thing or that, but examining the underlying assumptions---

Same person interrupting: dealing with the abstract.

Dr. Fetler: For example, Dr. Viktor Frankl in the movie *Value Dimensions in Teaching*, which was a very bad film artistic-wise--you know, you cannot hear it very well--but he points out that there's a lot to this; that possibly lack of dignity of humanity may be somehow interrelated with basic philosophical and scientific assumptions, and that mechanical determinism and so on are maybe involved in the world viewpoints which are producing a different kind of a mental attitude to human dignity and totalitarianism and these things. If the young people who are active will react to it, the dimension of understanding the underlying principles, then they will have a more complete scheme that will have long range effect. Immediately, however, you're concerned with correcting what immediately is wrong, that's fine, but it has to have an additional depth to it.

Same person in audience: In school we talk about history 150 years ago and leave out what happened yesterday. Yesterday is just as much a part of history as 150 years ago.

Dr. Fetler: Right, completely.

Same person in audience: O.K., so we're going to leave out what's going on today, the dehumanization of man, while we look back to the deep--

Dr. Fetler: Yes, yes, yes---What I, however, think is that the most practical thing would in the long run seem to be a very philosophical enterprise, but actually it has very practical meaning; and before we start deciding which are the values priorities, what are the important values, to find out what aesthetics has done, the philosophy of art, then find some standards for criticism, standards for evaluation. It's easy to agree on some prinicples which safeguard our evaluation in terms of what is relevant, what is really pertinent, what is more meaningful. These can be developed, standards of evaluation; before we really engage and say, I think this is the most important value, you think *this* is the most important value. This in itself doesn't clarify very *much*, but if we have some standards of procedure, methodological standards, these may lead to a more lasting contribution in the long run.

Another person in audience: Let me break in here for just a second, trying to pull something together. The student back here made some statements which I share. After our committees reported, just before dinner last night, I never heard so many high-sung phrases, all very beautiful, all very abstract; and I must admit I got a little bit sick. Not at the phrases themselves, because I think there is something behind them; but I began to realize that everyone was just sort of going through an educational catechism, and that's basically what it was. I think what is troubling you, and it's troubling me, is how do you translate all those so-called values into action.

Thus far we've made a pretty poor attempt at translating them into action, and I think there's where your frustration is. Tim is also trying to get at something that I think is a little more difficult to grasp, certainly for me, and that is, that we have all of these values listed, but in fact, what are they based on, what standards are we using to sort out these values so we can give them some sort of priority, so we can begin to understand what their meaning is, so that we can get down to the business of doing it? And I think it is this that a conference obviously can't deal with. I suppose we're not here to do anything. When we get back to our various campuses we're supposed to do something, I hope. We have a trustee, college presidents, who apparently intend to do something. I am very skeptical, however.

Another person in audience: I don't know whether I can say this very well, because my feelings and thoughts at this point are very personal; but I am reminded of Marshall McLuhan and his feeling about the messages--and I share it with Ken back there, the feeling upon arrival that what was going to happen was going to be pretty feudalistic. And I'm not so sure that what I thought was going to happen has actually happened. But what I'm trying to get at is this; the experiences I have enjoyed here which will change my behavior when I return have nothing to do really with the conclusions reached, necessarily, by the various workshops or the very erudite comments of our speakers, but the process which I went through at this conference. I remember the highlight as being a point at which Ken said in our workshop, "I understand you when you say it's difficult for an older adult to relate to young people, because you tell me that you understand how difficult it is for me to relate to older people." I remember the smiles of Cheryl back there, who commented very deeply about the same things in which I believe. What I'm getting at there is the human experiences which I've shared with some of the students--unfortunately, not enough--reiterate to me that the conference should have been set up with that idea in mind, that whoever set it up--and this is not really a criticism, because I understand the difficulties of an organization as large as C.J.C.A. and the history which has dictated that this is the way it should be--but when I return, I am going to be, I think, much more aggressive in my activities, based on the fact that I realize now that humans can work together, no matter what age they may be. That's the only thing I can contribute.

Another person: I just wanted to say to all faculty and administrators that I really got something out of this because, especially in our panel group, we got down to specifics. I have something I can take back to Cabrillo College, and I am going to try to get something going there. And it has really given me something specific to do.

Another person in audience: As a student from Cabrillo College attending this conference, I think, generally speaking, the conference was a failure in this respect. I think it was poorly organized; I think the students were not informed in advance; I think we got away from the topic of this conference: Values, Students. I think we were confronted with long drawn-out speeches that were totally unnecessary. The only time in this conference that I felt something was accomplished was during the small group sessions. We had an excellent group session, and I think in that group session we got something done. But why were we confronted with these long, long, drawn-out-speeches that bored the teachers, bored the administrators, and if they bored them, they certainly bored the students. [Laughter.]

We talk about concerns and values of the students; what's the unrest on campuses today? What is it students are rebelling against? And I want you all to ask yourselves, how--to what extent, did you touch it in this conference? To what extent did you discuss drugs on campuses, and why students are turning to drugs on campuses? And I don't want to get into a black or brown bag when I say this. That's the way this conference started out. I felt this right from the beginning. True, I think there is a need to advance the blacks in this country; and I think it's being done. I think a black in this country has a better opportunity than a white to get a position today. Businesses are opening up this field. Now I am speaking from my own point of view. I don't represent my college; I am a representative of a college, that's all. And I know what's happening in my college, and I know students are turning away. They're turning away from the educational system, they're dropping out. Why are they dropping out? Was this discussed in this conference? No I don't think it was.

Students want integrity in teaching. They're not getting it, because teachers are insecure in their positions, many of them. The teachers know more than they're teaching students. Dr. Sheller mentioned about teaching the students to become politically aware. When, in any generation, have you seen students that weren't more politically aware than now? The Vietnam demonstrations against the war, it started all with the students. Know the facts; know our involvement in Vietnam. I came back from Vietnam a year ago, and I know things that the news media never mentions. Why doesn't it mention them? The American public are totally ignorant of what is going on in Asia, the types of bombs that we use; we're a free democratic state, we use clean bombs. Well, you should see the types of bombs that we use. I was on an ammunition ship. Now there are so many things that needed to be discussed, so many things that the students are concerned with that weren't touched in this conference. In this respect, I think the conference was a failure. I'm sorry. [One or two people applauded.]

Another person in audience: I'd just like to make it short. When you term something a success or a failure, first you have to realize--what did you expect? I mean, what did you expect to happen; how much would you accept before you would term it as a success?

You can't weigh impressions or what affects a person's mind in pounds or dollars and cents. But there is a fear among students, and that fear is this: we can talk, we can get out, and we can express ourselves. We can say there is a need to do something, and then you can respond and say we agree; but you see, here's the point: agreeing isn't enough. Anybody can agree. It's taking an effort to do something about it that's important, because if you don't make that effort, then it remains the same. And it's the change--there's a need for a change, and action can only bring about change, not just agreeing. And I think that is the whole point. And I think that is where the fear lies within the students. [Light applause.]

Person in audience: The first question, you know, the guy said, why did they set it up so there wasn't room for certain ideas to come in? They set it up tightly because--this is my impression--they felt the students that were coming would rather sit and listen to speakers, and then go to dinner; that the administrators that were coming would rather sit and listen. They didn't think that they were bringing people here that wanted to do something.

Person in audience: Well, this conference hasn't been held since 1958. I think a lot of ideas that were used in 1958 probably carried over to the 1970 conference. [Laughter and light applause.] I think based on the experience we have had at this conference, the next conference may be a better one. I heard two excellent suggestions last night that I'd like to make to the conference committee, as a very temporary student who won't even be here next semester. First of all, this isn't done often enough, the values conference where we get down and talk about values. This conference strayed from the values issue many times because administrators and faculty and students don't sit down often enough and let their hair down; and I'd like to see an annual conference set up to discuss problems, current problems, that many campuses share. I'd like to see a conference that is concerned solely with specifics, and then every five years, perhaps, we could have a values conference, something that is concerned with the reasons behind why we're doing the things we are doing, rather than having one conference after eleven years and trying to get everything done in three days. Everybody came here with, I think, a little different idea of what the conference was supposed to be all about, and people were bound to be disappointed. I think we have accomplished some things. I don't think anybody is going to go away completely happy: but I would like to see it continued because I think that if we go with the right ends in mind, we can get something done at the next one and at the next one. [Light applause.]

Mr. Engle, Chairman: I hazard the guess that the committee that did the planning is listening to all these comments. I hope and believe that's the case. I must turn the microphone over to Dr. McCoy, who will give his post-mortem. But before I do so, I suggest the obvious: that we will, if we really want to do the kind of thing you're talking about, go back to the campus and for God's sake get to work there and do the sort of thing that you wanted to see happen here. And that will be two jobs: the theoretical job that Tim Fetler was talking about--and that will have to be continuous and not every five years; and, secondly, the practical job of sorting out priorities for action instead of just acting on impulse at all times. Dr. McCoy.

Dr. McCoy: Thank you. [Some laughter and applause.] We're caught in the Gutenberg galaxy. We have to talk fifty minutes to say anything. Now time must make poets of us all. What are the impressions of the conference that you've received? I remember the 60's opening with an inauguration, an old poet unable to read in the sun, and hope. Where did we go in the 60's? We went down hill. Where are we going in the 70's, the same place? We are here now, seventy-five of us left of a conference of 200. What do you remember of the conference? We are faced with a mountainous problem. What I want to ask from each of you, as many as wish, is a brief image of what you got out of the conference, a moment you remember or what you see as being ahead of us. It has got to be brief.

Person in audience: I got two things. One, I got something I can take back and work with. I got names that I am going to try and unify at the colleges. Second, I agree; there was too much frustration of students sitting back listening to some of these speeches and writing notes, raising their hand for fifteen minutes and not getting a question answered, and this is what we're here for.

Person in audience: I've had the opportunity of being in student activities for five years, and this is the first time that I've seen administrators, students, faculty members, and board of trustees and others interested sit down with some informal discussion for some period of time; and I think this is a real stepping stone. And I have been to lots of conferences.

Person in audience: If this program had been sent out early to students and the students didn't like it, they could have said, We don't want this. Now I think students should recognize this and demand a place in planning the next one. They're to blame for it if they don't say to Dr. Briggs and the rest of the committee, This isn't what we want. [This seems to be the sense of the indistinct and fragmented recording of the person's statement.]

Person in audience: I gained a great deal from listening to the speakers, and I appreciated the opportunity to hear them; and I intend to go back to my campus, Pasadena, and try to do something as a result.

Person in audience: I got to know why Ken, Mack Biggers, and a bunch of other people are unhappy--and this wasn't in the conference; this was outside the conference. But that is the thing I am going to take home.

Person in audience: Students, I would say, find out that action is much harder than words, and yet you have to have thought to lead to action; and I think this conference will help that. Also, some of you would make excellent teachers. Get into the education game, and you'll find you can do some things, and you'll find there are some things you can't do. The only way you really find out is to get in the education field. I think you can make that mark up there anywhere.

Dr. McCoy: O.K. The priorities, the guidelines of the students.

Person in audience: If we really take them seriously, we've got basis for action. The idea that the community college as an institution has a responsibility for its community--that's almost a new idea.

Dr. McCoy: Total education, meaningfulness, relevance, commitment, and action.

Person in audience: I would like to say, to the students especially, if you are interested in action, don't come here where you have students, faculty, and administration. Break off, have students and formulate

"Students' Day." Come in there and rap with the faculty, administration; see what's going on and talk to them. You know what you all think. Don't come here and be insecure, just get things done. [Some applause.]

Person in audience: I have been in education a long time, and I know about all the ropes. I have been through education in junior high, high school, administration, and retirement, and now back on the Board of Trustees. I think one thing you must remember, and that is no one, adult or any kind is anything but interested in you young people. We'd do anything to have you people make good. We make mistakes, but they will not be mistakes because of intention. It'll be because we haven't probably grasped everything. But also young people have a lot of enthusiasm. Wonderful! If they can receive some good guidance from us, they'll be a great generation. If they're not led down a blind alley. Now let's watch one more thing. I think this is a great thing because you're talking things over. In many societies this is not allowed. You can't discuss nor criticize. The faults that we have are in our hands. If we work together, we can correct them, because they are in our hands. Most of these things you speak of are ideals and will not be handled by specifics when they come up. The general things can't be handled specifically. We also have these regional groups where discussions occur in these regional groups. You might get directly with those areas. Well, I think we've done a good job.

Dr. McCoy: Yes, but the trouble is rhetoric is not always therapeutic on behalf of action. Sometimes it's an excuse to get rid of, to evade action.

Person in audience: As I reflect about what we have been saying this morning, I remember something somebody said on another Sunday morning after a kind of inspiring week-end: "This is a road that none of us can walk down alone." This business about going back to our campuses, and so on--it's just not possible to do any of these things alone. So we need to be aware of each other and of other allies so that we can support each other in these efforts that we are motivated about; which means that we really have community-building jobs to do. And I hear a lot of the values that we're hoping for and the things we see equal need to be built into intentional communities; and I see that as a big job.

Person in audience: I see this whole thing coming out as--this group emerging in a positive direction. For all the factions, whether it be administration or students or faculty or board of trustees, can work as one in the 70's, and I hope that this conference will give that direction. [Light applause.]

Dr. McCoy: Lynn Sheller reminded us of Robert Frost. I remember the poem "Fire and Ice":

> Some say the world will end in fire,
> Some say in ice.
> From what I've tasted of desire
> I hold with those who favor fire.
> But if it had to perish twice,
> I think I know enough of hate

To say that for destruction ice
Is also great
And would suffice.

What we need is less free hate and more free love for the 70's. [Applause.]

Dr. Engle: I would follow up with another quote from Robert Frost, a favorite of mine:

The woods are lovely, dark and deep.
But I have promises to keep,
And miles to go before I sleep,
And miles to go before I sleep.

Ken: Thank you.

Dr. Briggs, Conference Chairman: Thank you all for coming and contributing as you have. Go home and make it click from now on. The conference is adjourned.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

FEB 07 1975

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION